

MATTHEW DILLON



PILGRIMS  
*and*  
PILGRIMAGE  
*in*  
ANCIENT  
GREECE

PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE  
IN  
ANCIENT GREECE



PILGRIMS AND  
PILGRIMAGE  
IN  
ANCIENT GREECE

*Matthew Dillon*



London and New York

First published 1997  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in USA and Canada  
by Routledge  
270 Madison Ave, New York NY 10016

Transferred to Digital Printing 2007

© 1997 Matthew Dillon

Phototypeset in Garamond by Intype Ltd London

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*  
A catalogue record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-415-12775-0

**Publisher's Note**

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original may be apparent

# CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	ix
<i>Introduction</i>	xiii
1 OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES	1
2 THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS	27
3 PILGRIMAGE DESTINATIONS I: MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES	60
4 PILGRIMAGE DESTINATIONS II: CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS	99
5 PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS	124
6 CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES	149
7 THE FEMALE PILGRIM	183
8 ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES	204
<i>Notes</i>	228
<i>Bibliography</i>	279
<i>Index</i>	285



## PREFACE

This book began as a PhD thesis, and turning it into a book has been a far more challenging task than I had expected. I can only hope that it proves useful for those who are interested in ancient Greek pilgrimage.

Various people have made valuable comments and criticisms on this book, either in thesis or draft form, and I would like to acknowledge my debt to the following: Drs Lynda Garland and Minor Markle, Professors Trevor Bryce, Nick Hammond, Michael Jameson, Reinhold Merkelbach, Bob Milns, Josh Ober, Robert Parker and Noel Robertson. I thank them for their criticisms, advice, and encouragement, but the responsibility for all errors remains of course my own. In particular, I would like to express a debt of gratitude to Trevor Bryce, my Head of Department during the candidature of my PhD, for helping to arrange a period of study in Greece and Turkey which enabled me to visit the sites discussed in this book, and for his encouragement of my research. Dr Richard Stoneman took a keen interest in publishing this work, and his encouragement also needs to be acknowledged here. I would also like to thank Annette Ince for valuable advice on the layout of this book. Once again, I owe a debt to Dixson Library, University of New England, Australia, for helping me to obtain numerous books and articles which are not available in Australia.

As is usually the case, I have been inconsistent with the transliteration of Greek names, preferring where possible to reflect the original but on the other hand retaining familiar spellings such as Socrates and Plato, Athens and Corinth.

Matthew P. J. Dillon  
University of New England, Australia  
July 1996





## ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Alt. Perg.</i> 8.3	Habicht, C. (1969) <i>Altertümer von Pergamon. Die Inschriften des Asklepieions</i> , Berlin.
APF	Davies, J.K. (1971) <i>Athenian Propertied Families</i> , 600–300 BC, Oxford.
ARV <sup>2</sup>	Beazley, J.D. (1963) <i>Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters</i> , 2nd edn, Oxford.
CEG I	Hansen, P.A. (1983) <i>Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculorum VIII–V A. Chr. N.</i> , Berlin.
CEG II	Hansen, P.A. (1989) <i>Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculi IV A. Chr. N.</i> , Berlin.
CID	Rougemont, G. (1977) <i>Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes</i> , vol. 1, Paris.
DAA	Raubitschek, A.E. (1949) <i>Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis</i> , Cambridge.
<i>Didyma II: Inschriften</i>	Rehm, A. & Harder, R. (1958) <i>Didyma II: Die Inschriften</i> , Berlin.
FD	<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> .
FGH	Jacoby, F. (1954–64) <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , Leiden.
FHG	Müller, C. (1849) <i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> , Paris.
Fontenrose	Fontenrose, J. (1978) <i>The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses</i> , Berkeley.
GHI	Tod, M.N. (1948) <i>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions</i> , vol. 2, Oxford.
HCT	Gomme, A.W. (1945–56) <i>A Historical Commentary on Thucydides</i> , vols 1–3; with Andrewes, A. & Dover, K.J. (1970–81), vols 4–5,

# ABBREVIATIONS

	Oxford.
<i>IAG</i>	Moretti, L. (1953) <i>Iscrizioni agonistiche greche</i> , Rome (see also <i>Olym.</i> below).
<i>I. Cret.</i>	Guarducci, M. (1935) <i>Inscriptiones Creticae</i> , vol. 1, Rome.
<i>I. Ephes.</i>	Wankel, H. (1979) <i>Die Inschriften von Ephesos 1a. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien</i> , vol. 2.1, Bonn.
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> .
<i>I. Ilion</i>	Frisch, P. (1975) <i>Die Inschriften von Ilion. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien</i> , vol. 3, Bonn.
<i>I. Magn.</i>	Kern, O. (1900) <i>Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander</i> , Berlin.
<i>I. Perg.</i>	Fränkel, M. (1895) <i>Inschriften von Pergamon</i> , vol. 2, Berlin.
<i>I. Priene</i>	von Gaertringen, F.H. (1906) <i>Inschriften von Priene</i> , Berlin.
<i>IvO</i>	Dittenberger, W. & Purgold, K. (1896) <i>Die Inschriften von Olympia</i> , vol. V, Berlin.
<i>LP</i>	Page, D. L. (1941) <i>Select Papyri: Literary Papyri</i> , vol. 3, London.
<i>LSAG</i>	Jeffery, L.H. (1961) <i>The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries BC</i> , Oxford; & A.W. Johnstone, rev. edn (1990) with suppl.
<i>LSAM</i>	Sokolowski, F. (1955) <i>Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure</i> , Paris.
<i>LSCG Suppl.</i>	Sokolowski, F. (1962) <i>Lois sacrées des cités grecques: Supplément</i> , Paris.
<i>LSCG</i>	Sokolowski, F. (1969) <i>Lois sacrées des cités grecques</i> , Paris.
<i>LSJ<sup>p</sup></i>	Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. & Jones, H.S.A. (eds) (1968) <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th edn, Oxford.
<i>M&amp;B</i>	Tzachou-Alexandri, O. (ed.) (1989) <i>Mind and Body: Athletic Contests in Ancient Greece</i> , Athens.
<i>Michel</i>	Michel, C. (1900) <i>Recueil d'inscriptions grecques</i> , Paris.
<i>Milet</i>	Wiegand, T. et al. (eds) (1906–) <i>Milet: Ergebnisse</i>

#### ABBREVIATIONS

	<i>der Ausgrabungen seit dem Jahre 1899</i> , Berlin.
ML	Meiggs, R. & Lewis, D.M. (1988) <i>A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century BC</i> , 2nd edn, Oxford.
MPG	J.-P. Migne, <i>Patrologia Graeca</i> .
OGIS	Dittenberger, W. (1903–05) <i>Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae</i> , vols 1–2, Leipzig.
Olym.	Moretti, L. (1957) <i>Olympionikai. I vincitori negli antichi agoni olimpici</i> , Rome; see also Moretti (1970), (1992).
Parke & Wormell	Parke, H.W. & Wormell, D.E.W. (1956) <i>The Delphic Oracle</i> , vol. 1: <i>The History</i> ; vol. 2: <i>The Oracular Responses</i> , Oxford.
PCG	Kassel, R. & Austin, C. (1983– ) <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , Berlin.
PMG	Page, D.L. (1962) <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> , Oxford.
RC	Welles, C.B. (1934) <i>Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period</i> , London.
RE	<i>Paulys Real – Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (1894– ), Stuttgart.
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> .
SIG <sup>3</sup>	Dittenberger, W. (ed.) (1915–24) <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , 3rd edn, vols 1–4, Leipzig.



## INTRODUCTION

Dio Chrysostom at the turn of the first century AD described the Isthmian festival (panegyris) in honour of Poseidon, celebrated near Corinth, as drawing people from many places throughout the Greek world, from the Greek cities in modern France to those of the Black Sea (he mentions specifically Ionia, Sicily, Italy, Libya, Massilia in France, and Borysthenes on the Black Sea). He also commented on the activities which took place at the same time as the festival, such as public recitations, and noted the presence of peddlers and fortune-tellers.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the festival at Olympia every four years attracted contestants and spectators from throughout the Greek world, while the Pythian festival held for Apollo at Delphi was attended by people from 'the ends of the earth',<sup>2</sup> and as a festival was second only to Olympia. Diodoros writes of a crowd of 20,000 at Olympia, and while this might be an exaggeration, clearly the visitors were to be numbered in the thousands. The stadium at Nemea, where a festival for Zeus was celebrated every two years, is estimated to have held 40,000 spectators, but from personal observation this is probably far too high a figure.<sup>3</sup> At the time of the panhellenic festivals – those in which all the Greeks, regardless of where they lived, participated – thousands of people travelled to worship the gods honoured in these celebrations. The Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia and Nemea were the most important of these, and were known as the 'crown games', where the prizes for contestants were wreaths rather than money. The Panathenaia at Athens, held annually with an especial celebration, the Great Panathenaia, every four years, rivalled these four but was never considered to be quite in the same league.

But in addition to festivals there were various sacred sites throughout the Greek world which attracted large numbers of

## INTRODUCTION

worshippers: oracular centres, mystery cults, and healing sanctuaries. The pilgrimage in search of a cure for a medical condition was not restricted to any particular event or season. There were a number of sanctuaries which the sick could visit in search of a cure, the most important of which was the sanctuary at Epidauros, where Apollo and his son Asklepios provided cures: the Asklepieia at Kos and Pergamon in Asia Minor were also important healing centres. Many testimonies are available from Epidauros, dating to the classical period, left by pilgrims who claimed that they had been healed by the god, which detail the experiences of the sick: the patients slept in a building known as the abaton, and prayed that the god Asklepios would appear in the night and heal them by means of a dream. Women as well as men travelled to these centres from throughout the Greek world.

The Greeks sought the advice of the gods on numerous matters. Delphi was the seat of the god Apollo, and a popular destination for consultants, particularly during the classical and hellenistic periods. Here the deity spoke through the medium of a priestess to deliver prophecies to all those in need of advice on questions of importance to themselves, which could range from political issues to matters of bad crops, marriage and childlessness. Mystery celebrations such as the annual rites held at Eleusis, which was a centre of great importance for nearly a millennium, attracted participants from all over the Greek world, male and female, slave and free, who came in the hope of enriching their everyday lives and enjoying a pleasant afterlife, rather than the shadowy existence which was the dour fate offered by Homeric epic.<sup>4</sup>

Sanctuaries and festivals could also serve to reinforce ethnic and local ties and at the Panionion the Ionians of Asia Minor would gather together to worship Poseidon; a further Ionian festival took place on the island of Delos in honour of Apollo, and at regular intervals the Ionians of the neighbouring islands would gather to worship the god in sacrifice and hold athletic and musical competitions. The Dorians of Asia Minor and the cities of the Troad koinon also had festivals restricted to their own groups, while the Boeotians had a pilgrimage of their own, the Great Daidala at Plataea, which involved all the major Boeotian cities and towns.

Greeks travelled to sanctuaries, usually with a specific purpose – in search of advice from an oracle, a cure from Asklepios, or initiation into a mystery cult – but in the case of festivals involving

## INTRODUCTION

contests, they went to compete or spectate. But all of these activities involved the central feature of Greek religious practice: that of sacrifice. No oracle was received, or initiation took place, or festival celebrated without the sacrificial victim, whose head was doused with water or grain to make it nod, indicating assent at its own destruction to propitiate the presiding deity.

Travelling to sacred sites outside of the territory of one's city-state was clearly important as a cultural phenomenon amongst the Greeks. But how is this phenomenon described?<sup>5</sup> The Greeks, it appears, did not have a specific word which corresponds to our word 'pilgrimage'. Their expressions referring to those travelling to religious sites are very literal. The Athenians in one decree concerning a bridge on the Sacred Way between Athens and Eleusis, the route taken by all initiates, refer to 'those going' to the rites.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, Athenaeus could refer to those who went to Delos for the sacred celebrations in honour of Apollo on the island where he was born as 'those coming'.<sup>7</sup>

In the Peace of Nikias in 421 between Athens and Sparta, recorded by Thucydides, a clause about access to the panhellenic shrines guarantees the safety of those wishing 'to go' to the sanctuaries. In this treaty and the earlier armistice between the two states, those wishing to consult the Delphic oracle, pilgrims in every sense, are referred to as 'those wishing to consult the oracle'.<sup>8</sup> Clearly Thucydides is referring to pilgrims who wish to go to the shrines, but there is no more specific terminology than this. The great panhellenic sanctuaries themselves, so dominant in the political and religious life of the Greeks, are also referred to in the Peace of Nikias simply as the 'common shrines', and the treaty guaranteed the right of all Greeks to travel safely to these common shrines, both by land and by sea, 'to go, to sacrifice, to seek an oracle and to watch'. Pythagoras compared life to a festival (panegyris): some went as competitors, others as to a market, but the best went as spectators, literally, 'the watchers' (theatai).<sup>9</sup> Nothing was allowed to interrupt the worship at these festivals and shrines: when Xerxes invaded Greece in 480, the Olympic festival and its contests continued, and the Greeks 'watched' the athletic and equestrian events.<sup>10</sup> Kleomenes II attacked the city of Argos during the Nemean festival when the city was full of the 'festival crowd and spectators'.<sup>11</sup> Those attending a festival (a panegyris) were referred to as 'those attending a panegyris' (panegyrizontes).<sup>12</sup>



## INTRODUCTION

Other vocabulary used of travel to sacred sites is significant: *theoroi* literally means viewers, and refers primarily to delegates sent by states to represent them officially at festivals as a mark of piety; *theoroi*, in the sense of delegates, also came to be used of those who announced festivals. Sometimes instead of *theoroi*, simply the word 'andres' (men) is used. But for the Olympic festival every four years and for the annual Eleusinian Mysteries, *spondophoroi* were sent out; once again this term is literal, and means 'truce-bearers', those who went to states proclaiming a sacred truce for all those who wished to attend. Those who received *theoroi* announcing a festival or those attending one were known as *theorodokoi*, *theoroi* receivers.

All of the language associated with visiting sacred sites is literal. There is, then, no one Greek word to describe the activity of visiting sacred sites. The English words pilgrim and pilgrimage as used in this book are therefore not direct translations of a particular Greek word or phrase, except in so far as they reflect expressions such as found in the Peace of Nikias: 'those wishing to go, to sacrifice, to consult the oracle, to be spectators, at the common sanctuaries'.<sup>13</sup>

The victors at Olympia for the eighth century as recorded by Sextus Africanus and in the literature were mainly Peloponnesian (the festival's traditional foundation date was 776).<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, the Homeric poems apparently provide evidence that pilgrimage was established in or by the end of the eighth century: Odysseus, on his way to Troy, is said to have put in at Delos to worship at Apollo's altar, and tells Eumaios that he had also consulted the oracle of Zeus at Dodona. Amphinomos' suggestion to the suitors that they consult the will of Zeus may be a further reference to the oracle at Dodona.<sup>15</sup> The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* mentions the Panionian celebration at Delos, and Thucydides accepts the hymn as evidence for the existence of the festival in the distant past.<sup>16</sup> Homer, if the tradition is accepted, visited Delphi, as did Hesiod. This is probably untrue, but at least shows that the Greeks themselves had a belief in the antiquity of their pilgrimage tradition.<sup>17</sup> Certainly, the 'cosmopolitan range' of the dedications at the panhellenic sanctuaries from the late eighth century onwards indicates a movement of individuals bearing gifts from their own states to cult centres in other areas,<sup>18</sup> though it is possible that consultations of the Delphic oracle, reputed to be from the eighth

## INTRODUCTION

century and probably even those from the seventh, can mostly be rejected as evidence for pilgrimage activity at those dates.<sup>19</sup>

The establishment of panhellenic contests in imitation of the Olympic festival in the sixth century testifies to the fact that pilgrimage was an established practice in the Greek world in or before that date, though it should be stressed that in the archaic period individual pilgrimage would have predominated, and organised official pilgrimages by *theoroi*, requiring a sophisticated political organisation, may have developed more gradually.<sup>20</sup> Official pilgrimage is, however, definitely a feature of the Greek world in the sixth century.<sup>21</sup> At the time of the great panhellenic festivals, ships plied the oceans from the very peripheries of the Greek world, Spain, Egypt, Cyrene and the Black Sea to the sanctuaries in Greece and Asia Minor. Boys, youths and men went as competitors, and horses also crossed the seas to compete in chariot-races. A great flurry of diplomatic activity accompanied this: before the festivals, officials were sent out by states hosting the festivals to announce the date of their celebration and to seek acceptance for sacred truces which would guarantee the safety of the pilgrims. Invited states in turn sent official representatives (*theoroi*) to attend the festivals and make sacrifices on behalf of their state. In addition to these periodic celebrations, pilgrimage sites such as Delphi and Epidauros, open throughout most of the year, attracted a steady stream of pilgrims seeking divine guidance and assistance.

Greek pilgrims have left no individual testimony behind except for the records of miraculous cures at Epidauros and Lebea. What is known about Greek pilgrimage therefore tends to be impersonal, with individual testimonies lacking. Literary sources, however, provide some information about what it was like to journey to and stay at a pilgrimage site. Inscriptions too provide much evidence for regulations at sacred sites, and indicate the wide range of concerns which pilgrims gave to sanctuary authorities. Some of these regulations dealt with the need for ritual purity while participating in sacred rites, and these often concerned women, who from the male perspective were a source of impurity because of sexual activity and birth. There were also restrictions on diet, clothing and ornaments worn while participating in cult ritual. At many sanctuaries there was a great deal of emphasis placed on orderly behaviour, and punishments were laid down for misdemeanours, with fines for free men and beatings for slaves. The activities and needs of pilgrims while at sacred sites were also the

## INTRODUCTION

subject of restrictions which regulated pilgrim accommodation at sanctuaries, the parking of any vehicles, such as wagons and carts in which they had travelled to the site, the lighting of fires, the use of water and bathing facilities, and the provision of markets. With the volume of traffic involved at pilgrimage sites, the organisational requirements at sanctuaries must have been extremely complex.

From the sixth century BC to the fourth century AD, that is, for at least a millennium, the ancient Greeks made pilgrimages to their holy places, an impressive example of the continuity of a particular religious practice. The main focus here, however, is on the classical and to a lesser extent the hellenistic periods. Throughout this period pilgrims would have been a characteristic feature of the Greek landscape. Travel *en masse* or of large groups of individuals was otherwise unknown, except for the movement of armies in times of war, and the only other regular travellers would have comprised merchants and traders. Pilgrims would therefore have been a very noticeable feature of Greek life, and even if pilgrims often tended to come from the higher socio-economic groups, pilgrimage was one of the few opportunities for the ordinary citizen, barring military service, to travel and visit other sites and cities. Generally these pilgrims would have been inspired by their own needs and concerns, though some would have combined religion with entertainment, travelling to festivals as spectators of contests or to view processions and the pageant of festival activity. There is, however, little evidence to suggest that there was a pilgrimage circuit in existence. Athletes might make a *periodos* (circuit) of the panhellenic contests, but there is no evidence that others also did so. In general each site was visited with a specific and very personal purpose in mind by individuals motivated by the hope of initiation, oracular advice, or physical well-being.

Pilgrimage – that is, paying a visit to a sacred site outside the boundaries of one's own physical environment – was clearly important as a cultural phenomenon amongst the Greeks. In this context, any journey undertaken for a specifically religious purpose, and which involved an overnight stay at the pilgrimage centre, can be considered a pilgrimage. A definition that would seek to grant pilgrimage status to sacred sites only if these occurred outside the territory of an individual's state would necessarily have exceptions. Significant here would be the procession from Athens to Eleusis, some 22 kilometres, a journey which along with the

## INTRODUCTION

various cult acts performed along the way would have taken up the better part of a day, with the mysteries themselves requiring several days' presence at Eleusis. This ensured that the Eleusinian Mysteries constituted a pilgrimage not only for the non-Athenians being initiated, but also for those Athenians involved. Despite the fact that each urban centre and rural area in the Greek world had its own particular holy places – temples and shrines, and features of the physical environment, such as groves, caves and mountains – worshippers, for a variety of reasons, also chose to travel outside of their normal locality and worship the gods or seek their assistance in other places. Accordingly, they travelled beyond their local boundaries and visited sanctuaries which, for one reason or another, transcended the sanctity of local cult areas.



## OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

In the ancient Greek world pilgrims were reminded of the approach of a panhellenic festival and invited to attend it by messengers sent out by the state which was organising the event. At the same time these messengers would also announce a 'sacred truce'.<sup>1</sup> The acceptance of this by cities and states signalled the beginning of a sacred truce in which cities would allow unhindered access through their territory for pilgrims who wished to attend the forthcoming festival. These truces did not affect any ongoing hostilities, and warfare did not cease throughout the Greek world. Rather, the truces covered only the safety of the pilgrims travelling to and from the sacred site in question, and depended for their validity upon universal acceptance throughout the Greek world, for if one state refused to accept the truce, then the safety of pilgrims was threatened.<sup>2</sup>

### SACRED TRUCES

It was the task of the official announcers of sacred truces, usually known as *theoroi* but for certain festivals called *spondophoroi*, to travel to specific destinations to seek acceptance of the sacred truce. They would be given lodgings and hospitality in the places which they visited by *theorodokoi*, 'theoroi receivers', with this institution known as the *theorodokia*. The same term, *theorodokoi*, was used to describe the individuals who would host the officials, also known as *theoroi*, sent to particular festivals in order to represent their state.<sup>3</sup>

The aim of the sacred truces was to ensure that pilgrims enjoyed security while on the way to celebrate festivals at sacred sites; a guarantee of safety was an expected precondition of such journeys

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

to panhellenic pilgrimage sites.<sup>4</sup> A sacred truce covered the period immediately before, during and after the sacred celebration, and it guaranteed the safety of all those travelling to and from the festival, as well as of those at the site itself. Pilgrims could even make their way freely through states which were openly at war, and combatants were bound to respect the status and privileges of pilgrims.<sup>5</sup>

A sacred truce was referred to by the terms *ekecheiria* or *spondai*. *Ekecheiria* was, of course, a term not merely employed for religious festivals but also for political truces.<sup>6</sup> The Eleusinian Mysteries and the other major panhellenic festivals, the Olympian, Pythian, Isthmian and Nemean, were accompanied by truces. A specific period seems to have been set aside for the sacred truce of each festival. The dates for the truce of the Eleusinian Mysteries are well attested: fifty-five days were allocated for the truce for both the Lesser and the Greater Mysteries, and in these cases the terms *spondai* or *mysterioides spondai* are found, and the term *ekecheiria* is apparently not used in connection with this festival.<sup>7</sup> In the fifth century, the Athenian sacred truce for the Lesser Mysteries ran from Gamelion 15, through Anthesterion to Elaphebolion 10, while the Greater Mysteries began in Metageitnion 15 and went through Boedromion (the month of the Greater Mysteries) into Pyanepsion 10.<sup>8</sup> Athenian *spondophoroi* on one occasion in the third century do seem to have announced the Panathenaia (Hekatombaion), Eleusinia (Metageitnion), and Greater Mysteries (Boedromion) in one journey,<sup>9</sup> but *spondophoroi* could set out well in advance of a sacred truce,<sup>10</sup> so that this particular occasion is not evidence for any lengthening of the truce.

The Olympic truce was referred to both as *spondai Olympiakai* and as an *ekecheiria*, and it was the duty of the Olympic *spondophoroi* to announce the *ekecheiria* to those cities that wished to take part in the festival.<sup>11</sup> The mythical background for this truce is recorded, unlike those for other festivals, and the terms of the Olympic truce were written on a discus which was reputedly that of Iphitos of Pisa who on the advice of the Delphic oracle revived the Olympic festival in 776 BC, and re-established the *ekecheiria* for it; it had been originally established by Herakles. The discus on which the truce was inscribed could be seen at Olympia.<sup>12</sup>

Another term found in conjunction with festivals is *hieromenia* – the sacred month, in which time any city holding a major festival was not to be attacked. Clearly in the case of the Eleusinian

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

Mysteries and the Pythia, the hieromenia no longer had a literal interpretation, as the truces for these festivals were longer than the month in which they were held. The length and precise dates of the Olympic truce are uncertain, but suggestions range from a literal sacred month – a hieromenia – to as many as four months.<sup>13</sup>

The Olympic truce may only have lasted one month, but this festival was of great panhellenic significance, and given that the hieromenia included the five days given over to the festival, and more importantly that pilgrims travelled long distances to attend, a period of more than one month is extremely probable. Additionally, athletes had to be in Elis one month before the Olympic festival began,<sup>14</sup> so presumably the truce would have been in effect for their period of travel and commenced several weeks before they were due in Elis.

The dates for the other truces are also not attested.<sup>15</sup> The Pythian festival took place in Delphic Boukatios (equating approximately to Athenian Metageitnion, and to Gregorian August and September), and the announcers of the Pythia were sent out in the month Bysios, some five months prior to the festival, to announce the ekecheiria.<sup>16</sup> The Eleusinian spondophoroi, in order to announce a fifty-five day truce, did not set out so far in advance, but about forty-five days before the truce came into effect. There is evidence for an Isthmian truce, with Thucydides referring to Isthmian spondai for the celebration of 411; the festival was proclaimed and the Athenians invited, so there was clearly an epangelia (an announcement) of the spondai, delivered by Corinthian theoroi.<sup>17</sup> The Nemean festival apparently guaranteed the asyilia (sanctity) and asphaleia (safety) of contestants, which Aratos was accused of violating in the third century when he enslaved the competitors, and presumably these were guaranteed for the festival by an ekecheiria.<sup>18</sup> A hieromenia, sacred month, is referred to for both the Pythian and Nemean festivals, and it is possible that their truces were for the period of this holy month;<sup>19</sup> the original function of the hieromenia might well have been as the sacred period before, during and after a festival when a sacred truce was ordained.<sup>20</sup>

It was clearly expected that such truces would be accepted by the states to which they were announced. The Athenians guaranteed the safety of all those pilgrims who attended the Eleusinian Mysteries, not only on Attic soil but also for pilgrims travelling through other territories.<sup>21</sup> Aeschines reports as unusual the



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

response of the Phokians in the 350s to the spondophoroi announcing the sacred truce for the Eleusinian Mysteries:

When the spondophoroi announced the truce of the mysteries, the Phokians, alone amongst the Greeks refused to accept the truce. . . . Those announcing the Mysteries reported that the Phokians, alone of all the Greeks, had not accepted the truce . . . to prove that I am telling the truth, call the spondophoroi.<sup>22</sup>

The fact that the Spartans' presence at Dekeleia caused the Eleusinian procession to be interrupted in the later years of the Peloponnesian War seems to suggest strongly that they did not accept the truce. Furthermore, that the spondophoroi sent out to announce the sacred truce covering the Eleusinian Mysteries to the Trichoneians in 367/6 were captured and imprisoned indicates that the sacred truces were not always accepted.<sup>23</sup> These are isolated incidents, and sacred truces do seem to have been generally observed. If a state did not accept a sacred truce this at least provided a warning for those pilgrims who might otherwise have travelled through the territory of that state. There were penalties for those who did not abide by the sacred truce once accepted. For example, the Eleians excluded the Spartans from the Olympic festival in 420, on the grounds that the Spartans had sent troops to Lepreon, in Elis, after the Olympic truce had been proclaimed in Elis (though not in Sparta).<sup>24</sup>

States interested in participating in the Eleusinian Mysteries were asked to maintain the sacred truce throughout their territories, and those who did so were to be numbered amongst those states which could make use of the shrine. Those who did not accept the truce would not be granted access to the mysteries. The Eleusinian Mysteries might seem to lack the status of Olympia in the sense that the Athenians, unlike the Eleians, do not seem to have had the power to impose fines on those not observing the truce.<sup>25</sup> However, exclusion, such as the Athenians threatened against those who refused to accept the truce, was a harsher penalty than a fine, and even the Eleians used exclusion as the ultimate penalty against the Spartans in 420.<sup>26</sup> Aeschines' statement that the Phokians were unique in not accepting the truce makes clear its universal validity under normal circumstances.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, the provisions for announcing the Pythian truce make it clear that those states which did not accept the truce would be excluded from the shrine.<sup>28</sup>

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

When the Magnesians established a panhellenic festival, the Leukophryena, in honour of Artemis in the third century, the *theoroi* who were sent out asked the Greek states to accept an *ekecheiria* for the festival and the various states agreed to abide by this. The invitation decree is itself preserved, presumably as delivered by the *theoroi* when announcing the festival.<sup>29</sup> Similarly, the *theoroi* sent out to announce the Koan Asklepieia, founded in the third century, sought acceptance of the festival and also asked that its *ekecheiria* be respected, and states agreed to do so.<sup>30</sup> In the Milesian decree which invited all of the Greeks to participate in the newly founded festival at Didyma, the Didymeia, it is pointed out that not a few countries (*ethne*), cities and kings have in the past granted *asylia* to Didyma.<sup>31</sup>

Messengers were dispatched to announce sacred truces only for those religious centres that focused on an annual, or more infrequent (such as a four-yearly, penteteric) celebration. Religious sites which did not focus on a specific occasion as the main activity of the sanctuary attracted pilgrims throughout the year and not for a particular event. Accordingly, the oracular shrines of Dodona, Didyma and Delphi, and healing shrines such as those at Epidauros, Oropos and Kos, did not send out invitations for pilgrims to consult the oracle or to seek a cure, and pilgrims would come to partake of the sacred services provided by the sanctuaries in question throughout the year. However, Delphi, Epidauros, and Kos had, in addition, special penteteric events and to these, because they were held only at long intervals, pilgrims were invited by means of special messengers.

The announcers of the sacred truce were sometimes termed *spondophoroi*, 'truce bearers'. But this specific term, as applied to the bearers of the sacred truces, was unique to the Eleusinian Mysteries and the Olympic festival.<sup>32</sup> It is possible that *spondophoros* is an archaic term, and that these two festivals represent the older festivals of the Greek world, and that panhellenic festivals established later did not make use of this terminology, but rather used the term *theoroi*. There are also cases where those sent out to announce a forthcoming festival are not called *theoroi* but simply ambassadors (*presbeutai*).<sup>33</sup> Perhaps the very antiquity of these two festivals reserved this term for their special use, while festivals inaugurated later, or which acquired a panhellenic character only at a later date, may have made use of a plainer term out of a sense of religious awe for what must have been the oldest

of the panhellenic religious celebrations. That the spondophoroi seem to have been chosen from a special group at these two places is perhaps also relevant. The Athenians had a tradition of appointing their spondophoroi from just two families (the Kerykes and the Eumolpidae), while at Olympia, the sons of theokoloi ('servants of the god') had this privilege, pointing to the antiquity of this institution and its name.

One inscription extends the use of the term spondophoroi to those announcing the Panathenaia and the Eleusinia in addition to the mysteries, but this might simply be because the spondophoroi had been made responsible not only for the epangelia (announcement) of the mysteries but also for the epangelia of these two other festivals. The Panathenaia took place in late Hekatombaion and the Eleusinian Mysteries in Boedromion, about one and a half months later, so these spondophoroi probably set off early in Hekatombaion or even earlier.<sup>34</sup> Similarly, Polybius mentions two separate theoriai announcing respectively the Panathenaia and the mysteries, so the situation in the inscription did not always apply.<sup>35</sup>

In Olympian inscriptions there are references to theoroi and their theorodokoi, among them Damokrates of Tenedos who was honoured as theorodokos of the Eleian theoroi.<sup>36</sup> Because of this, Latte dismisses the evidence of Pindar, who mentions that Nikomachos of Athens was known to 'the heralds of the Olympian season, the spondophoroi of Zeus', since they had received 'some friendly favour' from him. Latte argues that Pindar has avoided the correct technical term in referring to the announcers as spondophoroi rather than theoroi, and he argues that only for Eleusis is the designation spondophoroi certain.<sup>37</sup> But spondophoroi are referred to in other Olympic documents, and it can hardly be assumed that these spondophoroi merely performed local duties,<sup>38</sup> and were not panhellenic truce bearers.

The heralds of other sacred truces, which included those for the Pythian, Isthmian, and Nemean festivals, were apparently not known as spondophoroi but as theoroi.<sup>39</sup> The Argives sent out two heralds to announce the commencement of a sacred truce at the time of Agesipolis' invasion in 388/7. These have been taken to be spondophoroi, but Xenophon uses the word 'heralds', and furthermore the religious event involved may not have been the panhellenic Isthmian festival as has been sometimes assumed.<sup>40</sup> Prior to festivals theoroi were dispatched to announce them and

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

their respective truces. The decrees of the third century, recording the acceptance of the establishment of new panhellenic festivals, included provisions that the states accepting these celebrations observe a peace for the duration of the festival. Spondophoroi and the theoroi announcing festivals fulfilled the same function.

Spondophoroi and theoroi would naturally have travelled to all the Greek states of which citizens had previously attended festivals, visiting all major cities and confederations. Athenian spondophoroi are, however, actually attested as having visited only a handful of the places to which they must have journeyed: Aetolia, Egypt, the Ionian islands, Phokis, Syria and Thessaly.<sup>41</sup> On the basis of an inscription at Delphi, in which Delphic sacred heralds take an oath, it has been thought that spondophoroi would have taken an oath prior to their departure.<sup>42</sup> Another inscription outlines instructions for the Athenian spondophoroi, who were clearly charged with fulfilling specific tasks; any oath they swore presumably contained an injunction to obey these instructions.<sup>43</sup>

Religious officials announcing festivals tended to travel in delegations of two or three members. Athenian spondophoroi announcing the Greater and Lesser Mysteries would be chosen from the families of the Kerykes and the Eumolpidai, and would travel as a pair, one being chosen from each family:<sup>44</sup> the duty of announcing the sacred truce was restricted to two families closely associated with the Eleusinian Mysteries. Athenian financial accounts record three delegations of spondophoroi setting out at different times of the year in order to announce the truce for the Greater Mysteries, and while it is possible that the same pair travelled to three different destinations, returning to Athens after their invitations to each city or region had been issued, it seems more probable that there were three different pairs charged with visiting different locations. The theoroi announcing the Magnesian Leukophryena and the Koan Asklepieia both travelled to various destinations in a 'round trip', as other theoroi would also have done.<sup>45</sup>

The field of invitees was wide, covering the Greek world: a task for more than one pair. The delegations of Eleian spondophoroi responsible for announcing the Olympic festival are recorded as consisting of three members.<sup>46</sup> It should probably be assumed that there were several parties of three, each trio travelling to a particular part of the Greek world, as the field for participants in the Olympic festival was as wide as that for the Eleusinian Mysteries.

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

An Athenian decree of the third century, promulgated by the Kerykes and the Eumolpidae, praises a hierophant for writing the announcement, *epangelia*, of the sacred truce and for doing the task with 'goodwill' (*eunoia*).<sup>47</sup> This practice is usually assumed to have been the usual procedure,<sup>48</sup> in which a written form of the *epangelia* accompanied a formal announcement to the appropriate authorities.<sup>49</sup> The states that were invited to the newly created Koan Asklepieia and Magnesian Leukophryena passed formal decrees accepting the invitation and confirming the status of the festivals.<sup>50</sup> It is probable that a similar procedure formalised the acceptance of the sacred truce announced by the *spondophoroi* in the form of a written acceptance of the *epangelia*, ensuring that there was unambiguous proof of the acceptance of the peace.

Because *spondophoroi* and *theoroi* could come into contact with military activity, they would have needed to be immediately recognisable. Garlands may possibly have served as a recognition device, and *theoroi* placed wreaths on their wagons.<sup>51</sup> Sceptres were the traditional insignia of heralds, and the remains of a carved sceptre on the statue base of a *spondophoros* at Olympia suggest that this was a normal part of their equipment.<sup>52</sup> Since heralds were regarded as inviolable,<sup>53</sup> it seems reasonable to extend this to the *spondophoroi*; moreover, the Athenians, in objecting to the Trichoneian detention of *spondophoroi* for the Eleusinian Mysteries, protested that the action was 'contrary to the common laws of the Greeks'.<sup>54</sup>

#### FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR SACRED HERALDS

The sacred heralds would have required some form of financial assistance in their travels. In one of the financial accounts of the Eleusinian overseers and the treasurers of the 'Other Gods', three payments are recorded as being made to the *spondophoroi* of the mysteries.<sup>55</sup> When they arrived at particular sites they will have been provided with food and lodging; for example, the city of Gonnos chose *theorodokoi* to entertain the Athenian *spondophoroi*. These *theorodokoi* would have provided the *spondophoroi* with their requirements while in the city.<sup>56</sup> The *spondophoroi* would, however, presumably have met with other expenses on their journeys (such as the cost of food as they travelled from place to place), for which they would have required a direct sum of money. The *spondophoroi* for the Greater Mysteries sent out

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

to the islands received money in the first prytany; the total amount, as restored, was 250 drachmas. After the entry recording a payment for the Dionysia in the Piraeus, there is mention of another payment for the spondophoroi for the Greater Mysteries, and another later in the account for spondophoroi for the same mysteries, in a context that cannot be dated.<sup>57</sup> Only the first entry records a destination, the islands, so perhaps the later entries are payments for some domestic duty. The usual interpretation, however, is that the entries refer to spondophoroi setting out at different times according to the proximity of their destinations.<sup>58</sup> The spondophoroi, as receivers of public money, presumably would have been liable to an audit (*dokimasia*) on their return to Athens, and it is also possible that the spondophoroi submitted a report which was published. An inscription dealing with the Eleusinian Mysteries refers to the *dokimasia* in a context which seems to concern the spondophoroi. A sacrifice after the *dokimasia* (which may or may not have been for the spondophoroi) is mentioned; this would accord with the religious practice of thanking the gods for assistance with a successful mission.<sup>59</sup>

#### THE INVIOABILITY OF SACRED HERALDS

The first payment for those travelling to the islands in order to announce the Greater Mysteries took place in the first prytany, and assuming that they set out at once (the money would not have been paid very much in advance), they would have had at least a few weeks to make their announcement in the islands before the truce came into effect on Metageitnion 15, more if they set out in early Hekatombaion. A second payment for the Greater Mysteries came at the time of the Dionysia in the Piraeus. This took place in the tenth and final prytany for the year, indicating that these particular spondophoroi had been sent out to announce the mysteries with a minimum of forty-five days in which to make the *epangelia*.<sup>60</sup> At what time the Eleian spondophoroi were sent out is unknown; the Eleians and the Spartans had a well known altercation on the point at which the truce came into force.<sup>61</sup>

The spondophoroi were the bearers of a truce which was sacred and which had the sanction of the gods, and they were announcing festivals which were being held in honour of the gods: they were inviolable and it was impious to attack them. When the spondo-

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

phoroi sent out by Athens to announce the sacred truce of the Eleusinian Mysteries were seized and imprisoned by the Trichoneians, members of the Aetolian League, the Athenians passed the following decree:

Since, after the league of the Aetolians had accepted the sacred truce for the mysteries of Demeter of Eleusis and of Kore, those who proclaimed the truce, members of the Eumolpidae and Kerykes, namely Prophetes and Epigenes, have been held in chains by the Trichoneians, contrary to the laws common to the Greeks, there shall be chosen by the boule right away a herald out of the Athenians at large, who is to go to the League of the Aetolians and demand that the men be released.<sup>62</sup>

The 'laws of the Greeks' may refer to matters of custom, rather than written obligations, but it should be noted that the Eleians did have laws governing the sacred truce of Olympia, laws generally recognised and respected. This expression 'contrary to the laws of the Greeks' points to the novelty of the spondophoroi being attacked, and the provocation to the Athenians was the greater, in that the sacred truce had already been accepted by the Aetolian League. The seizure of the spondophoroi can perhaps be related to the tension existing between Athens and Thebes at the time, a tension including Thebes' ally, the Aetolian League.<sup>63</sup> That there was a political motivation for the seizure is perhaps the best explanation, as it appears that pilgrims and pilgrimage officials in the Greek world were generally safe, and that it was the dangers of actual warfare which would be most feared by pilgrims. In this case the Athenians placed their hope for the recovery of the spondophoroi in the ability of the league to discipline one of its member states. The outcome of the incident is not known.

Significantly, it was not enough that the league accept the truce on behalf of the Aetolians; the spondophoroi, having proclaimed the truce to the league officials, then went on to announce it in all the league's member states. This could have been a matter of tradition: the spondophoroi, before the creation of the league, had always visited the states which came to constitute it, and continued to do so afterwards. The visits of the spondophoroi to the individual states could also point towards a necessity to proclaim the truce actually on the soil of each.

Spondophoroi were presumably necessary because, although

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

states might know that the date of the festival was coming up, they might have desisted from breaking off hostilities against the host-state until the last possible moment, which could lead to misunderstandings and to violations of the truce. The necessity of proclaiming the truce is illustrated by the attack of the Spartans on Eleian territory after the Eleians, as they themselves claimed, had already proclaimed the sacred truce in their own territory. The Spartans could not have failed to have known that the truce was about to be effected, but they argued that it required the actual proclamation of the truce in Spartan territory for the truce to be operative.

Plutarch points out the difficulties of the Greek calendar, observing that different groups of Greeks had different beginnings and endings for their months, and Weniger argues that the multiplicity of calendar systems in the Greek world led to the development whereby the truce was announced by spondophoroi informing cities when festivals were going to occur.<sup>64</sup> This explanation is only partially satisfactory because it is hard to believe that individual states would not have had some idea of when panhellenic festivals were about to take place in terms of their local calendar.

#### THEORODOKOI AND THEOROI

Most of the pilgrimages in the Greek world were undertaken by private individuals who, for one reason or another, decided to travel to a particular sacred site. Side by side with this there were what could be called 'official pilgrims' attending specific religious celebrations. City states would send out representatives to attend a festival which was taking place at a certain site, and these representatives were also known as theoroi, while their journey to the sacred site, and the activity they undertook there, was known as a theoria. The most important states ensured that there were representatives of their state at all the major festivals. Athens, for example, sent theoroi to the major panhellenic festivals – the Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia and Nemea, and in the hellenistic period to the festivals at Magnesia, Kos and Alexandria. These theoriai enabled a state to be officially represented at the festivals, and to take part in cult activities. Moreover, it seems that private individuals who wished to go on a pilgrimage to festivals at these sites could, at least in some cases, accompany the official theoria.



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

A city about to celebrate a festival would send out ambassadors to various Greek cities inviting them to attend that festival and to accept the terms of a truce covering the festival. These ambassadors were often termed *theoroi*, the same term as the one used for those ambassadors sent as the official delegation to a festival. Both types of *theoroi* would be received by *theorodokoi*: there were *theorodokoi* who received *theoroi* announcing a festival and other *theorodokoi* who received *theoroi* representing their states at the actual celebrations.<sup>65</sup> The *theoroi* bringing word of a festival would not have to find their own accommodation upon arriving at a city or town, but rather would be provided with lodging and hospitality by a *theorodokos*.

However, while inscriptions at sacred sites list numerous *theorodokoi* for the *theoroi* announcing a festival, it is interesting to note that there are only five known cases of individual *theorodokoi* hosting *theoroi* attending a festival.<sup>66</sup> There are cases where the *architheoros* – the leader of the *theoria* – is referred to as a *presbeutes* with *theoroi*. The *theoroi* are also referred to in other, somewhat banal, ways, such as ‘the men’, ‘those announcing the festival’, ‘those arriving’, ‘the men chosen to announce the festival’.<sup>67</sup> In the various acceptance decrees engraved at Kos of the states who accepted the invitation of the Koans to participate in the *Asklepieia*, the *theoroi* entrusted with the task of conveying the invitation are generally referred to as an *architheoros* and *theoroi*. But, in some of these decrees, reference is made to those announcing the Olympia and the Pythia, and these are described merely as ‘those announcing’.<sup>68</sup>

Despite this varying terminology, the cities receiving invitations all had specially chosen officials known as *theorodokoi*, who, no matter how the cities referred to the delegations which brought the invitation to the city, were responsible for both receiving the delegations and looking after them. For example, the city of Gonnos which referred to the delegation which brought the invitation as simply ‘men’ (*andres*), nevertheless elected an official designated as a *theorodokos* to receive the delegation.<sup>69</sup>

The *theorodokoi* of a polis where a religious celebration was taking place would receive the official delegates sent to represent other states at that particular sacred event. The role of these ‘receivers of *theoroi*’ probably also included that of providing shelter and hospitality for them. When the festival, as in the case of Olympia, was not held at a particular town or city, there would

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

not be theorodokoi to take care of theoroi, who would need to find their own accommodation, like the Athenian theoroi to Olympia, who stayed in a tent.<sup>70</sup>

The exact nature of the theorodokia can be deduced from the manner in which the theorodokoi were chosen, since their office, at least for those celebrations whose pedigree predated the historical period, had always been hereditary. The new panhellenic creations of the hellenistic period led to the need to choose theorodokoi to receive the theoroi announcing festivals. Those who were granted the honour of being theorodokoi for the theoroi announcing a forthcoming festival, and at least in some cases the theorodokoi chosen at the inauguration of a new festival, were granted this privilege for themselves and their descendants in perpetuity.<sup>71</sup> Therefore the office of the theorodokia was frequently a hereditary one. Individuals elected as theorodokoi for the position would presumably have nominated themselves for election, and one inscription expressly states that an individual Nikaïos 'willingly accepted' the theorodokia for the Panathenaia, Eleusinia and the Eleusinian Greater Mysteries.<sup>72</sup> A Corinthian and his descendants were awarded a hereditary theorodokia for the Nemean festival and that of Argive Hera.<sup>73</sup>

In some cases, general words meaning simply 'choose' are used when referring to the choice of theorodokoi, shedding no light on the method of their election. The Athenians directly elected the Athenian theorodokos to entertain the theoroi announcing a festival at Ephesos, possibly the Ephesia in honour of Artemis. At Thelpoussa, the theorodokos for theoroi for the Koan Asklepieia was directly elected. The Chians elected theoroi for the Delphian Soteria at the same time as they voted upon the decree of invitation, perhaps suggesting direct election of the theoroi.<sup>74</sup> When the Aetolian League accepted the invitation to attend the Nikephoria, newly founded by Eumenes II at Pergamon in 182, the league made arrangements that a theorodokos would be appointed in each league city to look after the theoroi who would come every four years to announce the Nikephoria. Similarly, the league of the Akarnanians did so for the Leukophryena.<sup>75</sup>

The Aetolians and Delphians accepted the invitation to attend the Leukophryena at Magnesia, but provisions to choose theorodokoi for the Magnesians theoroi who would in future years announce the festival are restored. King Antiochos III accepted the epangelia of the Magnesians but did not make arrangements

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

for theorodokoi. Presumably the king himself was to fulfil this role, as in this initial instance when he was approached about accepting the invitation. In two cases a city itself agreed to act as theorodokos.<sup>76</sup>

Nothing is specifically known about the socio-economic background of those chosen as theorodokoi, but there were several kings, at least one queen, tyrants and sons of tyrants who acted as theorodokoi.<sup>77</sup> The hereditary nature of the office suggests that the position had an aristocratic origin, and that it may ultimately have had its beginnings in the ritualised guest-friendship system which was a feature of archaic aristocratic society. The office of the proxenos was similarly hereditary in nature, and in it the survivals of this guest-friendship are explicit. Moreover, in granting privileges to individuals in other cities, a city often linked the duties of proxenos and theorodokos, granting the position of both in perpetuity.<sup>78</sup>

A proxenos was an individual whose duty was to take care of the representatives of a specific state when these travelled to his polis.<sup>79</sup> In Euripides' play *Ion*, Xouthos on his first visit to Delphi had stayed with a proxenos, and later, Xouthos and Kreousa in coming to Delphi to seek advice about their childlessness seem to have stayed with Xouthos' proxenos.<sup>80</sup> A proxenos' duties included looking after his guests in not only a political but also a material sense – providing them with entertainment, food and shelter. Proxenoï would have come from amongst the wealthy, those who could afford to 'entertain in style'. But the office of proxenos usually only made provision for delegates arriving on political matters, and not for theoroi visiting a polis or site for a religious ceremony, except in the case of Delphi where cities would have a proxenos with whom their representatives would stay when they came to consult the oracle. It is possible to draw a parallel between the proxenia and the theorodokia; in a similar fashion to the way in which the political representatives would be received and given hospitality by a proxenos, the theoroi attending a festival would be met by a theorodokos who would act as their host and provide them with accommodation. There seems to be a reference to this in Lucian when he writes that the pilgrims to the shrine of Assyrian Juno, on the Euphrates river, were received by hosts whom they did not know properly, but who had been appointed for each polis as host. The office of host at this shrine was hereditary, and the hosts were known as xenodokoi ('receivers of guests').<sup>81</sup>

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

Such a duty would presumably have been undertaken at a cost to the theorodokoi, who were expected to meet any expenses associated with entertaining the theoroi, and in this sense the duty was similar to a liturgy. This would tie in with the premise that the theorodokoi were from a wealthy socio-economic background. Their wealth would ensure that the theoroi were hospitably entertained, and that the theoroi carried back to their home-state suitably favourable reports of the hospitality of the host-city. The failure of one individual, Kraton, who had received ambassadors at Delphi in the late third century, to provide lodging of a standard commensurate with the expectations of the Theban ambassadors led to an unfavourable report at Thebes.<sup>82</sup> The polis celebrating the festival would itself generally not provide accommodation for theoroi attending the festival, and it, or the state sending the theoroi, would appoint an individual to meet this expense.

When the city of Magnesia in Asia Minor founded the Leukophryena festival, the city sent out theoroi to many Greek cities asking them to attend and to do so on a regular basis, and separate groups of theoroi took the message throughout the Greek world. The best preserved set of invitations relates to the establishment of the Koan penteteric festival in honour of Asklepios on Kos. The League of Islands, and Athens, accepted the invitation to participate in the penteteric festival (the Ptolemaia) which Ptolemy II Philadelphos established in Alexandria in honour of his father. The procedure for requesting attendance survives only for these new festival foundations, but in the case of long established festivals it was presumably the same.<sup>83</sup> The theoroi, once chosen, would have had to ensure that they left their home city in enough time to reach the festival city. Representatives from Sicily, such as Syracuse, which sent theoroi to the Leukophryena festival at Magnesia made a long journey.<sup>84</sup>

Each theoria, arriving at the city whose attendance was being requested, explained the nature of the festival, in the case of the Leukophryena stating that specific sacrifices were to be made to the goddess, and that contests were to be held. Why the festival was being established was also explained. For the Leukophryena, there had been an epiphany of the goddess Artemis, as a result of which the Magnesians had sought the advice of the Delphic oracle, which had advised the city to establish a festival to the goddess.<sup>85</sup> When the Magnesian theoroi arrived at a particular city, they invited it to accept 'for all time' the sacrifices and the contests

which had been established; the city accepting the invitation promised to send representatives 'for all time' in return. What this undertaking clearly involved was a decision by the city to send official representatives to the festival whenever it occurred.<sup>86</sup>

The social class of the *theoroi* also warrants consideration. There is little evidence to suggest who was eligible to be chosen as a *theoros*, and most cities simply state in the relevant decree that '*theoroi* are to be chosen'. In reality, however, it seems safe to assume that the *theoroi* chosen to announce a festival would come from an upper socio-economic group. They would need to be articulate, for even if they brought the terms of the truce or invitation written down they would have to enter into discussions with those accepting the truce on behalf of their community. Not only would they be involved in official discourse, but they would be received and dined in the official state dining hall (i.e. be given *xenia*), associating with the officials of the host-state.<sup>87</sup> Several of the *theorodokoi* who received them were obviously of high standing, and this was presumably reflected in the status of those whom they received. While there is evidence to indicate that *spondophoroi* would be chosen from specific aristocratic families, there is no evidence to suggest that the same applied to the *theoroi* announcing or attending festivals. Moreover, in Athens, which was a fully fledged democracy, the level of political participation was quite high,<sup>88</sup> and many Athenians would have been members, at some time in their lives, of the *boule*, the council of the 500.

It is perhaps possible that in Athens quite ordinary people could have been chosen as members of embassies, and that, as long as money was provided for travelling expenses, citizens not of the highest socio-economic class could be selected for *theoriai*. Possibly Athenian citizens in general may have been more articulate and socially aware than members of other states due to the greater degree of political participation at Athens at all social levels, though there is no firm evidence to indicate conclusively that any but upper-class Athenians served as *theoroi*.

At Athens the eponymous archon, immediately upon entering office, chose the *architheoros* who would lead the *theoria* to Delos. One known *architheoros* of the Delian *theoria* was Nikias, whose activities in this office are detailed by Plutarch; when Athens voted to accept the request of Ptolemy II to attend the inaugural *Ptolemaia* in Alexandria, they also voted that Kallias of Sphettos be the *architheoros* (280 BC). He and the other *theoroi* were elected by

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

show of hands in the *ekklesia*, indicating that popular acclaim was the method used in this case.<sup>89</sup>

The members of the Athenian *theoria* for the Pythia were chosen both by and from the *boule*, and Demosthenes notes that in the year that the Athenians boycotted the Pythia they chose no *theoroi* from the *boule*. In his speech against Meidias, Demosthenes states that Meidias was so impious that after having indicted Demosthenes on a charge of murder, he had allowed him to conduct initiatory rites and sacrifices for the *boule*. He had also, without protest, permitted Demosthenes to act as *architheoros* of the *theoria* which was being sent to the Nemean festival in honour of Zeus. Therefore it is possible that the *architheoros* and possibly the other *theoroi* for the Nemean festival were chosen from the *boule*.<sup>90</sup>

The decree of the Chians accepting the invitation to attend the inaugural *Soteria* at Delphi provides evidence from another state regarding the election of *theoroi*. This festival was being established to commemorate the repulse of the Gallic invaders from Greece, who had been turned back just as they had reached Delphi. The Chians resolved to choose *theoroi* for the *Soteria* immediately, but decreed that in future *theoroi* for this festival would be chosen at the same time as those for the *Olympia*. The terminology employed indicates that there was to be a direct election – by hands.<sup>91</sup> That direct election rather than lot was employed at Chios, while appointment was by an official in the case of the Athenian *architheoros* responsible for the Delian festival, indicates the social or financial standing of these *theoroi*. This use of direct election in choosing *theoroi* would, as in the case of other elective offices (such as the *strategia* at Athens), tend to favour the upper echelon: those who could afford to cultivate social and political prominence. If *theoroi* were to be called upon to engage in diplomatic activity, those with social prominence and political skills would be preferred. The Athenian *theoria* to Sounion, for example, which was seized by the Aeginetans in the 490s, consisted of many noble Athenians.<sup>92</sup> The fact that the captured *theoroi* were aristocrats is an indication that this *theoria* was considered to be an important activity.

Names of individual *theorodokoi* appointed to receive *theoroi* announcing festivals are known from the great *stelai* erected by the states hosting the festivals as a way of honouring these *theorodokoi*. The *theorodokoi* are listed by their place of residence, and

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

presumably these lists not only served an honorific purpose but also acted as a record for the theoroi setting out to announce festivals in particular places. These stelai indicate the vast extent of participation by the Greek states in major festivals throughout the Greek world.<sup>93</sup> Cabanes argues that the Epeirote cities of the Epidaurian theorodokoi list are arranged in the geographical order in which the theoroi visited them, while Giovannini argues that the catalogue of ships in the *Iliad* corresponds closely to the theorodokoi lists for the Delphian Pythia, that is, that the geographical order of the catalogue corresponds with the places which theoroi announcing the Pythia visited, suggesting that the Pythian theoroi visited cities in a predetermined order.<sup>94</sup>

#### THE EXPENSES INCURRED BY THEOROI

The costs of the official pilgrimages to various sacred sites were borne in three ways. The state could finance the entire theoria; the architheoros of the theoria could meet the expense; and there is also evidence to suggest that the burden could be shared between the state and the architheoros. At Athens, at least some of the theoriai were financed through liturgies, and this gave scope for the liturgist either merely to meet his obligation as required by the state, or to go beyond the minimal requirements and spend lavishly on the theoria in order to make an impression on the demos.

Aristotle, in writing that the greatness of the scale of liberality is relative to the splendour of the occasion or object, states that the amount of expenditure which would be great for a trierarch of a ship at Athens would not be extortionate for an architheoros; the cost of a trierarchia was approximately a talent.<sup>95</sup> Architheoriai at Athens could therefore be very expensive, though there seem to have been architheoriai which cost considerably less than the cost of a trierarchia. A speaker in a lawsuit claims that the liturgies of an architheoria, arrephoria and 'other things of the same kind' cost him 30 minas, and he is at pains to stress that he has spent a good deal of money on his liturgies.<sup>96</sup> Architheoroi would necessarily have come from the elite, given the expenses which they had to outlay. The best known architheoria is that of Nikias to Delos, and Plutarch's description testifies to a lavish expenditure. An early fourth-century inscription lists payments made to architheoroi and to a trierarch for the Delian festival, while Nikias in the fifth century financed the theoria apparently solely from his

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

own finances. Another inscription (323 BC) makes provision for a payment to the Athenian *architheoros*, seemingly for the Nemean festival, indicating that this *architheoria* was either completely or partially subsidised by the state. An *architheoria* is included in a list of liturgies at Priene, so it involved personal expenditure on the part of the *architheoros* involved.<sup>97</sup>

In some cities, *theoriai* do not seem to have been liturgic, and *ephodia* (travelling expenses), and money for sacrifices, was provided; the sacrifice would have been the main duty of the *theoroi* attending a festival. It has been argued that *ephodia* was paid at a rate of 1½ drachmas a day rising to 2½ in the late fourth century.<sup>98</sup> However, the fact that service on a *theoria* required time away from the home city, implying a leisured existence, would favour the wealthy for such service. Fifty drachmas were allocated by the Chians to *theoroi* for the sacrifice which they would make at the Delphian *Soteria*, and 30 drachmas for each *theoros* for *ephodia*.<sup>99</sup> The 'League of Islands' (the Nesioteic League) provided money for a crown, sacrifice and *ephodia* for the three *theoroi* it sent to Alexandria for the games established by Ptolemy.<sup>100</sup> When Ptolemy II Philadelphos in the early third century, established the festival of the *Ptolemaia* in honour of his father, Kallias was chosen as *architheoros* to lead the Athenian *theoria* to this first celebration of the festival. The *demos* voted money to him for the expenses associated with the *theoria*, but Kallias refused the money and conducted the *theoria* completely at his own expense (the amount of money which the *demos* offered to Kallias is the subject of restoration, but it might have been 50 minas).<sup>101</sup> Inscriptions give evidence that the state often provided money for the *theoroi* attending a festival, and that assistance might also be given to those *theoroi* who announced a festival. An *ekecheirion*, an allowance for those announcing the *ekecheiria*, was paid by some states invited to accept a pilgrimage truce. *Theoroi* bearing invitations would be offered dinner, *xenia*, in the *prytaneion* as well as money, the *ekecheirion* (not to be confused with payments of *ephodia* made by their home-state), presumably to help cover their expenses.<sup>102</sup>

An inscription of the Aetolian League prescribes that the *theoroi* bearing the *epangelia* from Pergamon were to receive as much hospitality as the *theoroi* announcing the Olympia, and that, as requested by the *theoroi*, the musical contests were to be recognised as 'isopythion' (equal to the Pythia), and the athletic and



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

equestrian contests at the festival were to be recognised as 'isolympion' (equal to the Olympia). A decree of Delphi is interesting in that it awards *xenia* to two individuals from Chersonasita on the Pontos because of their generosity in distributing to the Delphians the meat of 112 beasts which they had sacrificed. They had travelled to Delphi to sacrifice in response to an invitation by Delphi to attend the Pythia.<sup>103</sup>

There is some evidence that states refused to attend festivals as a means of making a political point. Demosthenes records that the Athenians in 346, outraged by the treatment which the Phokians had received at the hands of the Macedonians, refused to send their ancestral *theoria*.<sup>104</sup> Clearly, a diplomatic protest was intended.

In nearly all of the cases where the number of *theoroi* is recorded, either those who are announcing or those who are attending a festival, the number of *theoroi* is almost always three (this excludes the pilgrims travelling with them and the accompanying contestants if competitions were involved). Less commonly, two were chosen. For example, Kos sent out groups of two or three *theoroi* to invite states to attend the inaugural celebration of the penteteric festival in honour of Asklepios. Priene, which chose two *theoroi* to attend the Great Panathenaia at Athens, provides another example of a two-man *theoria*. The evidence of the Magnesian decrees is also clear on this point; three *theoroi* were sent out to announce the establishment of the Leukophryena and to invite Greek states to send *theoroi* to celebrations of the festival.<sup>105</sup> This can be compared to the Eleusian and Eleian *spondophoroi*, who travelled in groups of two or three.

#### SACRIFICES AND 'FIRST-FRUIITS'

The role played by *theoroi* in the festivals which they were attending is suggested by the etymology of the words *theoroi* and *theoria*. Possibly the original function of the *theoroi* was to observe the celebrations on behalf of their cities, and to provide official representation. Just as ordinary people attended the panhellenic festivals to watch the various contests, so too would this have been one of the activities of the *theoroi*. But the role of the *theoroi* was not limited to passive sightseeing; their most important role was probably to participate in the offering of sacrifices to the deity in whose honour the festival was being held.<sup>106</sup> The decrees which

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

accept new festivals invariably accept at the same time the sacrifices to be held at the festival. The cities sending delegations would be represented at sacrifices aimed at gaining the goodwill of the gods. It was clearly an attempt to win or to retain the favour of the particular deity for one's state, and many states, in agreeing to send *theoroi* to the Leukophryena at Magnesia, stressed that they were doing so because of their piety towards the goddess Artemis, emphasising their eagerness to 'show clearly' that they honoured the goddess. Implicit in this was the idea that not to send delegations to religious festivals was in some sense impious.

There are further examples which indicate that the main role of the *theoroi* was a sacrificial one. The Aetolian League undertook to send *theoroi* to the festival of Athena Nikephoria in Pergamon when 'the sacrifices are being made'. At the establishment of the Soteria at Delphi, the island of Kos decreed that the *theorodokos* and *theoroi* chosen for the festival were to sacrifice at Delphi a bull with its horns gilded to Pythian Apollo as a thanksgiving for the deliverance of Greece from the barbarians. Kallias as *architheoros* for the Athenian *theoria* at the first celebration of the Ptolemaia at Alexandria in 279/8 had charge, with the *theoroi*, of 'the sacrifice on behalf of the city'. When Antiochos IV was king in Judaea and Jason was the high priest of the Temple, the latter chose citizens of Antioch as *theoroi* to attend the penteteric games being held at Tyre. The main purpose of the *theoroi* was to sacrifice to Herakles, and they had been given money for this purpose; the *theoroi*, however, decided to use the money in a more constructive manner: they diverted it towards the building of ships. *Theoroi* from certain cities were also responsible for carrying first-fruits (*aparchai*) to the festival. In the fifth century, Athens required its allies to bring first-fruits to Eleusis, and also asked other states to do the same on the grounds of ancestral practice and the instructions of the oracle at Delphi.<sup>107</sup>

The demos of Priene decreed in 326/5 that they send a *theoria* of two men to Athens for the Great Panathenaia with a panoply of arms, first-fruits and sacrifices, as a reminder of the kinship between the two cities. The *theoroi* were to present a copy of the decree organising this to the boule and demos of the Athenians, in order that the Athenians know of the *eunoia* ('goodwill') which Priene felt for Athens, but perhaps this also reflects a point of etiquette, with the *theoroi* from Priene formally letting the Athen-

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

ians know of their desire to participate in this way in the Great Panathenaia.<sup>108</sup>

In addition to responsibility for sacrifices, the *theoroi*, and in particular the *architheoros*, had a duty towards other members of their polis who were also attending the festival. The account of Nikias' *architheoria* to Delos highlights this responsibility, since Nikias was responsible for the performance of the choruses, for their expenses, and for conveying them from Athens to Delos. The membership of the Andrian *theoria*, which seems to have involved a choir of boys performing at Delphi, suggests that a vessel was employed specifically for the purpose of conducting the *theoria*, rather than the *theoria* gaining a berth on a merchant vessel. The inscription recording its members states that it included three *architheoroi*, a seer, an archon, a herald, a flautist, several priests, and in addition there may have been a 'high priest'. There were also five men appointed by the *boule* to ensure that everyone in the Andrian *theoria* behaved themselves.<sup>109</sup> This provision seems to indicate that the *theoria* was a large one and the mention of children as members of the *theoria* reinforces this, and could imply the presence of women, unless the boys were old enough not to require a maternal presence. It seems certain then that the Andrian *theoria* to Delphi went on a ship devoted to this religious purpose.

The Delian *triakonter*, and the vessel bearing the *theoria* to Sounion, are two other examples in which a *theoria* would have occupied a vessel in its own right.<sup>110</sup> Given that many festivals had musical contests, to which states sent choruses, their care may have been one of the prime responsibilities for *architheoroi*. It is also possible that those participating in other contests at a festival travelled with the *theoroi*.

#### THEOROI AS DIPLOMATS

Instances of *theoroi* engaging in direct diplomacy while carrying out their duties are known. Deinarchos states that Demosthenes, *architheoros* to Olympia in 324, wanted to use his position as a means of obtaining an interview with Nikanor for the purpose of discussing Alexander's 'Exiles' Decree'. This suggests that the use of the office of *theoros* or *architheoros* for diplomatic purposes may not have been unusual. During the Peloponnesian War, when the Spartan king Agis and Sparta's allies were preparing to aid Chios in a planned revolt from Athens, Corinth would not join

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

in because it was the time of the Isthmian truce, which was under its jurisdiction. The Isthmian truce had been proclaimed and the Athenians sent theoroi: in the course of the festival the intentions of the Chians became clearer to these theoroi, who when they returned home made the situation known to their fellow Athenians, who took steps to counter the plans of the Spartans. Festivals were clearly an ideal venue for finding out information about events in other states. Two theoriai visiting Alexandria in the second century became involved in diplomatic activity, one announcing the approach of the Panathenaia, and the other the approaching date of the Eleusinian Mysteries. These theoriai were dispatched by Ptolemy VI to Antiochos IV to seek peace with the latter, and represented a neutral party for Ptolemy. In the late third century BC, a Cretan theoros travelling to Delphi, presumably for the Pythia, stopped *en route* at the Piraeus and divulged information which was useful to the Athenians about political conditions on the island. Another possible example is reflected by an inscription which honours an Athenian architheoros to Nemea in 323 'for the things which he reported to the demos of the Athenians'. Miller suggests that it was for sounding out allies for a revolt against Macedonian domination; this revolt, the Lamian War, broke out in Greece shortly afterwards.<sup>111</sup> When the great number of festivals, and the number of corresponding theoriai travelling to various cities, is considered, it is not surprising that theoroi became involved in diplomacy. Instead of a city choosing a special board of presbeutai, it is possible that theoroi, if they were heading in the right direction, might be employed for diplomatic activities.

Theoroi could be given physical protection by the states they visited: the Aetolian League in decreeing in the second century BC that theoroi were to be sent to celebrate the Nikephoria in Pergamon charge the incumbent strategos to look after them as they set out for Pergamon. When theoroi arrived at Philippi from Kos bearing an invitation for attendance at the Asklepieia, the demos accepted the invitation, but also provided them with a military escort to Nea Polis, a nearby coastal city; the demos of Philippi was accepting responsibility for the theoroi only to that point. The military guard may have been a guard of honour but it is possible that the theoroi had encountered trouble on their way to Philippi or that the demos knew that such lay ahead on the road to Nea Polis. The importance of this is indicated by the attack on

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the Peloponnesian theoria on its way to Delphi by the Megarians.<sup>112</sup>

Theoroi and theorodokoi were granted honours and privileges, and this was a matter of protocol, though no doubt also of prestige. The theoroi would report back to a relevant body when they returned home, and it was important that a city should not provoke negative comments on its hospitality. It can probably be assumed that the sacred nature of their mission meant that theoroi were accorded special treatment in the cities which they visited. Argos honoured a Thracian theorodokos for the festival of Zeus at Nemea (the Nemean games) and Argive Hera (the Heraia at the Argive Heraion). A statue base at Samothrace commemorates Parian theoroi; this might be a personal dedication, but more probably was made by the state of either Paros or Samothrace in return for services performed by the theoroi. Delphi granted hereditary honours, including promanteia, to a theorodokos. An Olympic victor from Tenedos assumed the theorodokia of his father and carried out his duties with eunoia, and was honoured at Olympia,<sup>113</sup> and theoroi announcing new festivals were routinely praised and honoured.<sup>114</sup> A decree from Tenos which honours Ammonios of Athens for being theorodokos for the Delian festival indicates that, at least occasionally, non-citizens could act as theorodokoi.<sup>115</sup>

#### PANHELLENIC PARTICIPATION IN FESTIVALS

The extent to which states participated in festivals can be seen by the degree of Athenian involvement in panhellenic festivals. In addition, they sent a sacred mission known as the Pythais to Delphi whenever the omens required it: individuals known as Pythaistai would keep watch from the altar of Zeus Astrapaioi, at Athens, for three days and three nights for each of three months, for lightning from the direction of Harma, near Phyle, an Attic deme bordering on Tanagra; when lightning occurred they took a sacrifice to Delphi by land.<sup>116</sup> Similarly, at Sparta, officials known as Pythioi had the responsibility of consulting the oracle on public affairs when the Spartans decided, probably in their assembly, to do so.<sup>117</sup> Apparently from about 100 BC, the Athenians sent a Pythais to Apollo on Delos, possibly at the same time as the Delphian Pythais.<sup>118</sup>

There was an Athenian theoria every four years to Delos.<sup>119</sup>

#### OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

There may have been a *theoria* sailing from Athens to Brauron and then to Delos, which had ceased by the fifth century.<sup>120</sup> A *theoria* to Sounion went by sea, and there also seems to have been an annual *theoria* by sea to Delphi.<sup>121</sup> During the Peloponnesian War the Athenians went by sea to Eleusis when the land route could not be used because of the Spartan fort at Dekeleia.<sup>122</sup> There were also *theoriai* to the Isthmia,<sup>123</sup> Nemea,<sup>124</sup> Olympia,<sup>125</sup> and to the oracle of Ammon at Siwah in Egypt.<sup>126</sup> Athenian participation in the Magnesian Leukophryena is attested.<sup>127</sup> An Athenian decree concerning the invitation to participate in the Koan Asklepieia is not attested, but given the wide range of the invitations which survive it is certain that Athens was invited to recognise and to take part in this festival, with the relevant decrees now lost.

The *theoria* sent by the Athenian tetrapolis to Delphi and Delos involved the tetrapolis as a unit of the Athenian state sending a delegation to the oracle and island. The tetrapolitan *theoria* presumably dated back to the time when the tetrapolis was an autonomous and prosperous group of cities independent of Athens, and when the tetrapolis became incorporated into the Athenian state the tradition of sending a *theoria* to Delphi and Delos survived. Similarly, the deme Acharnai in Attica sent an embassy to Delphi to ask whether it could build an altar of Ares and Athena Areia: just as in local political affairs the deme was independent, so too was it in local religious matters.<sup>128</sup>

Evidence points towards a high level of inter-city contact based on religious activity. Attendance at festivals probably motivated more high-ranking individuals to leave their cities and travel to other places than any other single factor, and on a more regular basis. In the third and second centuries there were many new festivals established, which meant that Greek states often sent their *theoroi*, and accompanying pilgrims, further afield than ever before. In particular, the establishment of the Ptolemaia in Alexandria meant that *theoroi* regularly made their way to Egypt to celebrate a Greek festival,<sup>129</sup> and the hellenisation of Egypt under the Ptolemies also caused *theoroi* announcing festivals to make their way to Alexandria.<sup>130</sup> The *theoroi* announcing the establishment of the Koan Asklepieia in the third century travelled to Italy and Sicily, mainland Greece, the Aegean islands, Alexandria, and Bithynia.<sup>131</sup> States accepting the Magnesian invitation to attend the Leukophryena included: Alexandria, the Seleucid dynasty, the *koinon* (league) of Crete, Pergamon, the *koinon* of the Boeotians,

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

Thessaly, an Aetolian state, the koinon of the Akarnanians, the Epeirotes, Gonnos, the koinon of the Phokians, Kephallenia, Ithaka, Athens, Megalopolis, the koinon of Achaea, Argos, Sikyon, Corinth, Messenia, Corcyra, Epidamnos, Chalkis, Eretria, Paros, Mytilene, Klazomenai, Rhodes, Knidos, Kos, Laodikeia in Lycia, Antiocheia in Persia, Gortyn, Syracuse, Antiocheia in Pisidia, Tralles, and an unknown Pergamene city.<sup>132</sup> Theoroi to the mysteries at Samothrace came from Thrace, Macedonia, the Aegean islands and the cities of the Asia Minor coast.<sup>133</sup>

#### CONCLUSION

Pilgrimage was clearly a highly organised affair, taken very seriously both by the organising state and attending states. Through the spondophoroi and theoroi who were received by theorodokoi, festivals were announced and states invited to send official delegations; another set of theorodokoi received the theoroi from states which wanted to be represented at the pilgrimage site. The phenomena of the theoria and theorodokia gave pilgrimage an institutional framework. This enabled designated persons to carry out official 'pilgrimage activity', and in doing so, the theoria and the theorodokia encouraged states to attend religious festivals. Through the universal official involvement of the Greek states these festivals prospered. State recognition of these festivals made it easier for ordinary pilgrims to travel to religious sites, either as part of a theoria sent by their state, or by themselves, by taking advantage of the asyilia, the inviolability, which their home-state had officially recognised for the sacred site in question. Sacred truces guaranteeing the safety of pilgrims, both those representing their states and ordinary individuals, encouraged pilgrimage activity and were an essential factor in attracting pilgrims to a particular celebration. The degree to which sacred truces did in reality protect pilgrims is a matter for further consideration.

## THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

Pilgrims often had to travel long distances, with the longest journeys made by those from the west, in Italy and Sicily, or Cyrene and Alexandria in Africa, who travelled to the panhellenic festivals of mainland Greece or to major festivals in Asia Minor. Such journeys were not without risks of various kinds, and the problems pilgrims faced *en route* highlight the importance attached to pilgrimage. Pilgrimage sites themselves could become the focus of military conflict: the Sacred Wars, for example, fought in the vicinity of Delphi presumably discouraged pilgrimage to the site.

### THE INVIOLABILITY OF PILGRIMS AND SACRED SITES

Despite the provisions of sacred truces and asyilia, inviolability, there are several examples of pilgrims who did meet with danger, but these give no clue as to the prevalence of such risks, and it cannot be conclusively decided whether attacks on pilgrims were recorded in the sources because of their rarity, or whether they were only described by ancient authors when they impinged on other events. Inscriptions are the main source for what is known about the provisions of asyilia, whereby Greek states recognised the inviolability of a sacred site, together with its polis and surrounding territory, if the site was in or near an urban area. Instances of attacks on panhellenic sanctuaries do occur, but the accounts suggest these to be atypical. The truces announced by spondophoroi and theoroi were generally sufficient to ensure a peaceful celebration of the religious festival involved. It seems reasonable to conclude that pilgrims generally did enjoy safety, as suggested by the continued popularity of the panhellenic festivals



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

and the fact that their sites and religious celebrations attracted visitors throughout the classical and hellenistic periods.

The sacred site was itself protected and was considered to be inviolable, that is, protected by the provision of *asylia*. For example, when various cities in the third century accepted the establishment of the Magnesian festival of the Leukophryena they accepted at the same time that the city and its territory had *asylia*.<sup>1</sup> In the same century, various states, at the inauguration of the Asklepieia festival on Kos, accepted the *asylia* of the shrine of Asklepios,<sup>2</sup> and Kos itself accepted the *asylia* of Didyma when Miletos invited the Greeks to participate in the Didymeia festival.<sup>3</sup> Major panhellenic sites of their very nature possessed inviolability, though this was not always observed, as in the case of Delphi when its *asylia* was disregarded by Perseus, son of the Macedonian Philip V, in the second century BC.<sup>4</sup> Not only did sacred sites have *asylia*, but apparently this term was also extended to participants in festivals. Plutarch in discussing how Aratos in the third century enslaved the athletes who were attending the Nemean games, to which he had in rivalry set up his own games, states that he violated the *asylia* and *asphaleia* guaranteed to participants.<sup>5</sup> As this incident indicates, participants had *asylia*, but sacred sites could in addition award *asylia* and *asphaleia* to *specific* individuals, guaranteeing their safety by land and sea, both in wartime and peace, during their journey to and from the site.<sup>6</sup> Plutarch records that after the battle of Plataea in 479, Aristides proposed that probouloi and theoroi from Greece gather at Plataea every year, and that every four years contests to be known as the Eleutheria be celebrated there to commemorate the freedom of Greece. The Plataeans were to be inviolate and consecrated.<sup>7</sup> The provision of *asylia* was clearly intended to safeguard both the sanctuary and the pilgrims attending a festival at a sacred site,<sup>8</sup> but this was not always observed: the centres of Delphi, Olympia and Isthmia suffered particularly in this regard, and Plataea itself was destroyed by the Spartans in 427.

There were few instances in which pilgrims encountered physical violence or met their deaths, and it appears that they were generally respected as they made their way to sacred destinations. However, the occurrence of such incidents indicates that piety was not universally practised. This is not surprising in view of the impiety found in the Greek world in other matters, such as sleeping in sanctuaries and military attacks launched during celebrations of

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

festivals,<sup>9</sup> and certainly does not indicate that pilgrimage was taken any less seriously than other religious practices.

#### THE SAILING SEASON

Sea travel was the most important form of transport for the Greeks, not only for those in the islands and those of the cities of Italy, Sicily and Asia Minor, but was also used as the means of travelling from one city in Greece to another. For example, the Athenian *theoria* for the Pythian festival celebrated at Delphi did not take an overland route, but travelled by sea. The ancient sailing season was from about April with the beginning of spring, to October, the onset of winter with its adverse winds, and summer was the main period of sailing activity.<sup>10</sup> For festivals to be attended by pilgrims, they needed to be held at a time of year when sea travel was convenient and easy, and it is no surprise that the major festivals of Greece took place in the summer. While festivals originated without reference to this factor, clearly this did become an important consideration in making particular festivals accessible to the rest of the Greek world. It is not surprising that the Delphic oracle closed for the three months of winter.

In the inscribed lists of the initiates in the mysteries on the island of Samothrace, which drew its clientele from Thrace, Macedonia, the Aegean islands and the cities of the Asia Minor coast, and which held several initiation ceremonies throughout the year, the dates given on the lists for when individuals were initiated are the months April through to November, which closely correlates with the sailing season.<sup>11</sup>

The sailing season was also clearly reflected in arrangements made at Athens for maritime cases in the courts. Maritime cases were heard from the months Boedromion to Mounichion, during winter, so that the cases could be settled to allow merchants to set sail when spring arrived.<sup>12</sup> The Athenian navy apparently extended the sailing season a little further, with the crews of the navy in training for eight months of the year,<sup>13</sup> though the dangers of winter sailing are illustrated by the inscribed naval list of 323 BC, naming ships which had been damaged by winter storms.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, one maritime agreement from Athens contains a penalty clause invoking extra interest on a maritime loan if the borrowers should leave the Pontos for the journey back to Athens

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

later than mid-September, for a ship leaving at this date ran the risk of running into storms.<sup>15</sup>

Hesiod, the Boeotian farmer much concerned with the management of the farm, provides information about sailing, though his bias against sea travel is clear. He warns that when the constellation Pleiades sets, pursued by Orion (about the end of October, or the beginning of November) and the winds blow, then ships should be hauled up onto shore, and the land tilled.<sup>16</sup> In winter in the Mediterranean there are strong winds from the north; reduced visibility also makes navigation difficult. When Apollonios of Egypt arrived at Olympia for the festival (held in July/August) without having completed the one month's training at Elis he alleged that he had been held up by adverse winds in the Cyclades, but his opponent was able to prove that he had instead been winning prize money in contests in Ionia.<sup>17</sup>

Hesiod advises waiting to go to sea until the season for sailing comes, and describes this as being for fifty days after the summer solstice.<sup>18</sup> This is the time to sail: the ship will not be wrecked nor the crew drowned (unless Zeus and Poseidon intervene); the winds are regular and the sea harmless. Here he is referring to the Etesian winds, now known as the meltemi, 'steady' winds which were ideal for navigation, though blowing from the north they could make northward journeys difficult.<sup>19</sup> But he follows this advice on when to set out with a warning as to when to return from any sea voyaging: before the 'new wine' and the autumn rain. Hesiod also comments on a brief sailing season at the beginning of spring (April), when the fig-tree sends forth its leaves; at this time the sea is passable, but there are risks involved.<sup>20</sup>

All four of the major panhellenic festivals were 'in tune' with the sailing season. Just as important was the fact that the major festivals avoided busy times of the agricultural year. Taking the festivals in their order of occurrence, the Isthmian festival in April took place during the brief early sailing season, followed by the Nemea in July/August, the Olympia in July/August (noting that for this festival the competitors had to arrive in advance for one month's training), and the Pythia in July/August. All these three were well within the summer sailing season, and with more than enough time for pilgrims to make their way home before the setting of the Pleiades. Morgan points out that the festivals avoided clashing with important agricultural duties: the grape harvest

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

beginning in mid-September, the olive harvest between November and February, and the grain harvest, May to July.<sup>21</sup>

Even when festival sites were located inland travel to them nearly always took place by sea. Pilgrims to Olympia made their way to Pheia, the port of Elis, and then on to Olympia, about 30 kilometres, and such a method would have been used for all the pilgrimage sites that were inland: pilgrims to Epidauros landed at the port and then made the 10-kilometre journey inland, while those travelling to Delphi would have put in at Kirrha.<sup>22</sup> Panhellenic festivals involved horse- and chariot-races, and teams of horses accompanied their owners on sea voyages to various festivals.

Naval journeys and undertakings required the blessings of the gods. Thucydides notes that the Chalkidians who founded Sicilian Naxos built the altar of Apollo Archegetes which stands outside the city, and theoroï sailing from Sicily first sacrificed at this altar. The theoria of Kos to Delos sacrificed to Apollo Dalios before departure. The rites which preceded the launching of the Sicilian expedition provide a well-known illustration of the general point. Thucydides describes the ritual preceding the departure of the fleet:

When the ships were manned and everything had been taken aboard for the voyage, the trumpet commanded silence, and the customary prayers before putting out to sea were made, not by each individual ship, but by a herald on behalf of them all. Bowls of wine were mixed for all the army, and the men and officers made libations from drinking-cups of gold and silver. The crowd of citizens and other well-wishers on the shore also joined in the prayer. Then when the hymn had been sung and the libations completed, they put out to sea.<sup>23</sup>

Significant here are the customary prayers which would have been a feature of any major undertaking such as a sea-borne pilgrimage. Pilgrims setting forth in a ship bound for a sacred site would possibly have engaged in some additional ceremony. The Athenian theoria sent to Delos began with the priest of Apollo, the deity honoured by the theoria, crowning the prow of the ship.<sup>24</sup> This religious ceremony was presumably intended not merely to honour the god, but also to invoke the blessing of the deity and ensure the safety of the passengers.

### PILGRIMS AND PIRATES

Because most pilgrims travelled by sea the primary danger in peacetime, except for the weather, was from pirates and enemy fleets. However, apart from the seizure of the Sounion theoria, more an act of war rather than of piracy, and Philip's towing away of a sacred ship, there is only one known example, that of Phrynon, of a pilgrim vessel meeting with attack, though piracy was prevalent throughout the classical and hellenistic periods.

The seizing of the ship which was conducting the Athenian penteteric theoria to Sounion to sacrifice to Poseidon occurred in the early fifth century, during the course of the conflict between Athens and Aegina. The aristocratic Athenian theoroi were captured and imprisoned, and the ship also presumably fell into Aeginetan hands. Herodotos dates the incident to before the First Persian War, and it had clear political ramifications with further political conflict developing over the issue.<sup>25</sup>

Philip II of Macedon for an unknown reason captured a sacred ship of the Athenians which was docked at Marathon, in the late 350s, and ancient sources claimed that the sacred ship in question was the Paralos. However, the ship was not involved in pilgrimage activity on this occasion, and rather than being an attack on pilgrims, the incident was merely an act of war on Philip's part.<sup>26</sup> Philip was involved in another incident involving pilgrimage; Phrynon, an Athenian visiting Olympia, was attacked during the Olympic truce of 348/7 and was captured by leistai (brigands or pirates). He had to be ransomed, and on his return to Athens requested that an ambassador be sent to Philip, to attempt (successfully as it turned out) to recover the ransom money. (The ambassador chosen was Ktesiphon.) The scholiast on the Aeschines' passage claims that the leistai involved were the soldiers of Philip, and this is generally accepted by modern scholars.<sup>27</sup> The scholiast is led to this conclusion presumably because he thought that the appeal to Philip needed a direct rationale, but this is not necessary, and the leistai did not have to be Philip's soldiers. That they were Macedonians and Philip's subjects meant that Phrynon could appeal to no authority for compensation but to the monarch.<sup>28</sup>

It was reasonable of Phrynon to expect compensation from Philip, as there are instances of monarchs who agreed to observe the *asylia*, the inviolability, of particular festivals and sacred sites.

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

Two groups of *theoroi* met Antiochos IV to announce the Panathenaia and Eleusinian Mysteries, and he agreed to accept the truce and the inviolability of the festivals.<sup>29</sup> This *asylia* was surely not simply a personal guarantee that the monarch would not lead his forces against the site in question, but also a commitment that his subjects would be expected to adhere to the conditions to which he had agreed, that a site would possess *asylia*, and that sacred truces would be observed.

Philip would have received *spondophoroi* at his court who had announced the commencement of the Olympic truce, and this would imply his acceptance of the truce for himself and his subjects. Perdikkas III of Macedonia, for example, was *theorodokos* for the *theoroi* announcing the Epidauria in the fourth century.<sup>30</sup> Perdikkas' reception of these *theoroi* was an undertaking that the Macedonians would not carry out hostilities against pilgrims travelling to Epidauros in this period. Similarly, the Aetolian League accepted the Eleusinian truce in 367/6, and when the *spondophoroi* who had announced the truce were seized by a member state the Athenians made their complaint, not to the member state, but directly to the governing body of the Aetolian League.<sup>31</sup> When a state accepted a truce, it must have been assumed that the truce bound all the citizens, even pirates.

This particular incident leads to the question of whether pilgrims were recognisable as such. They were not distinguishable by their dress, for although there is evidence that participants in various sacred rites had to wear a particular type of clothing for the purposes of the rite, nothing suggests that there was pilgrim garb. It is possible that pilgrims travelled to and from their destinations wreathed, just as *theoroi* seem to have been when on their missions to announce a sacred truce. The ship which conducted the annual *theoria* to Delos was garlanded; the wagons in which *theoroi* travelled were wreathed.<sup>32</sup> This would have been in honour of the gods but would also have served as a warning to potential attackers. Pilgrims, however, on a ship during the period of a sacred truce, even if garlanded, stood little chance of being recognised until their attackers actually boarded.

Presumably the zenith of the Athenian empire in the fifth century must have made the seas secure, and part of the Lykourgan programme in the 330s and 320s to revitalise Athens was the dispatch of war-ships to the Adriatic to deal with piracy.<sup>33</sup> But at times when there was no strong maritime control pirates may have

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

been a serious danger to pilgrims. However, even though pirates might have chosen not to observe sacred truces, as the case of Phrynon shows, the sovereign authority of their state might still have chosen to compensate victims of piratical activities.

The rules for the competitions at the Italian Sebasta, held at Naples, included the provision that competitors were to arrive at Naples for training for thirty days prior to the festival, but could still compete if they had a valid reason for being late, such as being attacked by pirates, or being shipwrecked.<sup>34</sup> Accordingly, the activity of pirates was obviously a concern to those organising panhellenic religious activities. The people of Teos, for example, requested at the end of the third century that their polis and the shrine of Dionysos be accepted as everlastingly sacred, *hiera*, and inviolable, *asylos*, as well as untaxable. The Teians were particularly keen to win favourable responses from the Aetolians and the Athamanians, because Teos was on the coast and as such was particularly vulnerable to pirate raids. Even if these states acceded to the request, this would have been meaningless unless they were able to exercise some constraint over the peoples that they represented and stop them engaging in piracy.<sup>35</sup> There is no suggestion that Teos was a panhellenic destination, but this particularly underlines the general point, since such status would have been even more essential for panhellenic sites attracting large numbers of worshippers. Safety on the seas was a necessary prerequisite for the success of the various panhellenic pilgrimages, and on occasion piracy necessarily presented some degree of risk to pilgrims.

#### TRAVEL BY LAND

Many pilgrims, of course, must have travelled to their destinations overland. The Peace of Nikias guaranteed the safety of those travelling to the 'common sanctuaries', whether they went 'by land or by sea'.<sup>36</sup> Strabo noted that while the Greeks founded their cities with an eye to location, harbours, security and the fertility of the soil, they placed little emphasis on road-making.<sup>37</sup> But the Greeks did have roads, and they did use them, building them where they were particularly needed; the Sacred Way from Athens to Eleusis is an obvious example.

The Greeks used several methods for building their roads. When a road traversed uneven rock outcroppings, the Greeks carved a pair of tracks into the rock (usually these are compared to railway

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

tracks), and there are examples of this method on the roads to several pilgrimage sites, those from Athens to Eleusis, Athens to Delphi, and Elis to Olympia. The Greeks did not pave roads where they ran over rocky ground, but might employ terraces to prevent soil being washed away by rain and worn down by constant traffic on the lower side of the road. For the crossing of streams the Greeks built a 'dam' of loosely piled rocks which water could flow through, with rocks heavy enough not to be washed away (the dry state of many of the rivers and streams for much of the year meant bridges were not always required). Important examples of bridges are those on the Sacred Way from Athens to Eleusis: one crossing the Kephisos and the other at one of the Rheitoi streams.

A decree of 422/1 provides for the construction of a bridge only 5 feet in width over the 'Rhetos near the city'; as the Rheitoi streams were between Athens and Eleusis, the Rhetos referred to here as being 'near the city' must have been the stream closest to Athens. The bridge was constructed so that the priestesses could safely carry the sacred objects (the *hiera*) across, but the decree specifically mentions that the bridge was to be built so that wagons could not use the bridge; the priestesses were to walk over with the *hiera*, the sacred objects, and the rest of the procession was to follow, also walking. The Eleusinian *anaktoron* had been destroyed by the Persians in the second Persian invasion; the stone from the ruins had been used for the sanctuary wall and what still remained unused was now to be used for the bridge.<sup>38</sup> A translation of the decree follows:

the Rhetos near the city is to be bridged us[i]ng stones from Eleusis from the ruins of the ancient temple, which were left after use on the wall, so that the priestesses can carry the *hiera* most safely. They are to make the width 5 feet, so that wagons may not be driven across but those going to the rites can walk. They are to cover the streams of the Rhe[t]os with stones in accordance with the specifications that Demomel[es the architect] draws up.

The wheel ruts in the road from Athens to Eleusis give a width between the axles of 1.45 metres (4 feet 9 inches), and consequently the width of the bridge itself was too narrow for Athenian carts, and was specifically designed to be so. In 321/0, a deme decree of Eleusis honoured Xenokles for the construction of a bridge over



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the Eleusinian Kephisos,<sup>39</sup> which would have made travel between Athens and Eleusis easier for pilgrims, and may well have been intended primarily for their benefit. The road to Eleusis was much traversed, and Pausanias provides a description of the route, all the way from the Dipylon gate at Athens to Eleusis.<sup>40</sup> It was also possible to go by sea, but this was not the usual method, and was used by the Athenians only when the land route was inaccessible: in the Peloponnesian War, after the occupation of Dekeleia in 413, the Athenians made the procession by sea. In addition to the long sacred way from Athens to Eleusis, there was the Sacred Way (*hiera hodos*) from Miletos to the oracle of the god Apollo at Didyma, a distance of 16½ kilometres, which seems to have been paved; a decree of the Molpoi ('Singers', a cult-association at Miletos) specifies several places along the way where the Molpoi would stop and sing. The procession seems to have been made several times a year for various rituals, but consultants of the oracle probably went directly to Didyma and need not have travelled to Didyma from Miletos via the Sacred Way.<sup>41</sup>

Clearly there were some good roads, for building materials, particularly for temples, had to be transported.<sup>42</sup> The sanctuary of Poseidon on the Isthmus, where panhellenic contests were held every two years, was located on the narrowest point of the Isthmus, and the road from Athens to Corinth must always have been very near the sanctuary;<sup>43</sup> of all the panhellenic sanctuaries Isthmia could be said to be the most 'centrally' located, being beside the most important land route in Greece. The location was especially suited to sea transport, and the popularity of the Isthmian festival was due in particular to its position on the Isthmus with the harbours on both sides of the Isthmus connected by the *diolkos*,<sup>44</sup> the paved 'road' on which ships could be moved across the Isthmus of Corinth to avoid the circumvention of the Peloponnese.

Some of the distances involved in travelling Greek roads are known. The trip from Athens to Olympia was a five- or six-day walk, and the distance could be viewed with apprehension. But the journey was also made by sea, which in good sailing conditions would have been much quicker.<sup>45</sup> Herodotos notes that the distance from the altar of the twelve gods in Athens to the temple of Zeus at Olympia was 1,485 stades (about 270 kilometres); clearly this was a well-known and well-travelled route.<sup>46</sup> Pausanias and Strabo provide various itineraries for roads between cities and sites. But

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

there is also the lesser known 'Notes on Greek Cities', attributed to Dikaiarchos but perhaps the work of Herakleides the Cynic, and dating to the late third century BC.<sup>47</sup> He mentions the journey from Athens to Oropos via Aphidna as a day's uphill journey on foot – if the traveller was without baggage – but notes that there were many inns along the way, allowing the traveller frequent rest and refreshments.<sup>48</sup> This was presumably the route of many pilgrims from Athens to Oropos, seeking cures at the Amphiaraion. Inn-keepers, however, according to Plato, had bad reputations.<sup>49</sup> It is also important to note that Herakleides regarded walking as the chief form of land travel. This was probably the route mentioned by Thucydides, who notes that after the Spartan occupation of Dekeleia, food from Euboia had to come to Athens by the sea route around Cape Sounion, rather than the quicker overland route from Oropos, where the food would have been landed, through Dekeleia and on to Athens.<sup>50</sup>

According to legend, Oedipus killed his father on the road from Thebes to Delphi; Pausanias writes that going from Daulis to Delphi the traveller comes to the 'Cleft Road', where the murder occurred; Forbes suggests that both men were travelling on a rutted or grooved road, in which one of them would need to leave the road to let the other pass. From here, Pausanias in the second century AD comments that the main road to Delphi becomes rather steep and more difficult for the walker.<sup>51</sup> Strabo notes that it was an ascent of 80 stades from the port of Kirrha to Delphi.<sup>52</sup>

An Amphictyonic law (380/79) orders the Amphictyons to repair roads and bridges, to maintain them, and to punish anyone damaging them; these were probably roads and bridges in the vicinity of Delphi, and the Amphictyonic centre at Pyloi. The provision may have been intended to make the journey easier for pilgrims. The Athenians sent the Pythais to Delphi by a land route which Apollo himself was said to have used in travelling from Delphi to Athens. A fourth-century BC Athenian horos (boundary stone), found near the Sacred Way of the Panathenaia, reads: 'Boundary of the Sacred Road by which the Pythais journey to Delphi'. Herodotos refers to a 'Sacred Road' from Delphi which went through Phokis and Boeotia. The Athenian women known as the Thyiades also made their way from Athens to Delphi by land. However, most of the Greek envoys, spectators and competitors for the festival probably would have come by sea, arriving at the port of Kirrha, and then have made their way to Delphi.<sup>53</sup>

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

A Peloponnesian *theoria* travelling in carts to Delphi was attacked by the Megarians in Aigeiroi, beside the lake. The wagon route from the Peloponnese to Delphi has been studied by Hammond: it passed through Plátanos, Tripodiskos, and the Vathikhória, and Hammond suggests that this *theoria*, if 'passing by watering points', would have gone from Tripodiskos to Ano-Alepokhóri and then to the basin of Megálo Vathikhóri, with the lake where the pilgrims were attacked in this basin.<sup>54</sup> A road useable by wagons indicates that this was an important route, and the presence of this *theoria* indicates that this was a pilgrimage road to Delphi for the Peloponnesians.

Thersandros of Halieis on the southern tip of the Argolid travelled to and from Epidauros in a cart.<sup>55</sup> An alternative means of transport was employed by Sostrata of Pherai,<sup>56</sup> who was taken to Epidauros on a *kline*, a couch or litter, but she may well have taken a ship from a port near Pherai to the port at Epidauros and then been carried inland on the couch. For those coming overland to festivals, both carts and litters would have been employed, while those who could afford it may have travelled on horseback or on mules. Even pilgrims to Epidauros and other healing sites might have proceeded on foot if the nature of the illness allowed, and economic necessity would have ensured that pilgrims in general travelled on foot.

#### THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR AND PILGRIMS

War could affect the attendance of worshippers at the panhellenic shrines. The armistice of 423/2 between the Athenians and the Spartans lasted up until the commencement of the Pythian festival in 422, so clearly the festival itself whose sacred truce would have been proclaimed far in advance was not a period of universal peace, though the area of the festival itself would have been *sacrosanct*.<sup>57</sup> One of the terms of the Peace of Nikias in 421 was that those who wished could consult the oracles or attend the common sanctuaries, travelling by land and sea, without fear.<sup>58</sup> This clause indicates the importance of pilgrimage for the Greeks, and confirms the obvious point that war was the greatest obstacle to the successful undertaking of a pilgrimage; the clause was probably a direct response to the problems which had been experienced by travellers to these sites in the past.

In the Peloponnesian War access to Delphi by land may well

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

have been difficult for the Athenians with the Thebans and Phokians allies of Sparta. There are also indications that Delphi may have been hostile to the Athenians during the Peloponnesian War. Thucydides has the Corinthian representatives at Sparta in 432 before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War say that the Peloponnesian League can borrow money from Olympia and Delphi to finance ship-building and for paying higher wages to sailors than the Athenians could afford. In 426, Sparta had allies for a campaign assemble at Delphi.<sup>59</sup>

The armistice between Athens and Sparta in 423 guaranteed the right of anyone who wished to do so to consult the Delphic oracle 'without fraud and safely'. The treaty accompanying the Peace of Nikias just a few years later in 421 had a similar but more extensive provision. It guaranteed the safety of those travelling to the shrines of the Greeks, to sacrifice, consult the oracles, or to be a spectator.<sup>60</sup> The guarantee of the right to consult Delphi seems to indicate that Athens had felt unable to do so, or had experienced difficulties in doing so. In making the armistice in 423 the Spartans undertook to send heralds to their allies the Boeotians and the Phokians to persuade them to abide by this agreement.<sup>61</sup>

It was also during the Peloponnesian War that the Athenians made their first official consultation of the oracle of Ammon (identified by the Greeks with Zeus) at Siwah, sending an official embassy to inquire about an expedition to Sicily; the consultation by Kimon's representatives in 456 while he was with the fleet in Cyprus was not authorised by the state.<sup>62</sup> It has been suggested that Zeus' oracle at Dodona was also consulted by the Athenians as an alternative source of prophecy because Delphi was pro-Peloponnesian, and the consultation of Zeus at Dodona about the introduction of the cult of Bendis to Athens seems to date to early in the Peloponnesian War.<sup>63</sup> A dedication made there by the Athenians from a naval battle with the Peloponnesians may date to the Peloponnesian War, but the year 459/8 has also been suggested.<sup>64</sup>

Gomme suggests that the revival of the Ionian festival of Apollo on the island of Delos in 426 might well have been 'to assert Athenian interest in Apollo, who at Delphi now seemed exclusively Peloponnesian and Dorian, and to start another international festival, the other four being, as it happened, in Peloponnesian hands...'. But it should be noted that the Athenians continued their participation in the four panhellenic festivals, with Thucyd-

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

ides specifically mentioning that they were invited to, and attended the Isthmian festival in 411, because this is how they came to learn of the planned revolt by Chios.<sup>65</sup> However, the Athenians had a policy of requiring allied participation in Athenian festivals, and the Delia may well have been reinaugurated in 426 to create an empire festival outside of Peloponnesian influence.

In brief, the Boeotians and Phokians may have made it difficult for states to consult Delphi, and Athens may well have felt that Delphi was biased towards Sparta. The terms of the 423 armistice and Peace of Nikias, however, leave open the possibility that Athenian consultations continued in some years. While individual pilgrims from Athens probably did not need to change their destination as long as their questions did not have a political motivation, they would still have needed to face the possibility of hostility on land and perhaps at sea on their journey.

Battles could still take place during sacred truces. In 394 Agesilaos had engaged, but failed to defeat, the Thebans in battle at Chaironeia, and after the battle he proceeded to Delphi, where the Pythian festival was being celebrated, and took part in the procession of Apollo which was part of the ceremonies.<sup>66</sup> The sacred truce must surely have been in force at the time when the Thebans and Spartans were fighting, but Plutarch records Agesilaos' actions without condemnation. Clearly, fighting and warfare could take place when a sacred truce was in force, as long as no pilgrims were harmed. The parties involved, Thebans and Spartans, had met freely in war, by mutual consent, and their struggle was confined to one battle in a fixed locality, which did not threaten the lives of any who might still have been on their way to the Pythia.

Such conflicts, however, must have inevitably endangered pilgrims at times, and surely the ideal truce was one in which there was absolutely no fighting in the vicinity of a sacred site celebrating a festival, as only in such circumstances could a truce truly guarantee safety. After all pilgrims who knew that hostilities were taking place in the area through which they had to pass in order to reach their pilgrimage destination would certainly have been wary of setting out, while pilgrims who were returning home from a sacred celebration, confronted with military activity, would have had to take their chances and rely on the piety of the combatants.

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

### THE ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES IN THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

Aelius Aristides states that the truce for the Eleusinian Mysteries was the only one never to be violated,<sup>67</sup> and in support of this statement he lists some known irregularities in the observances of other sacred truces. All three violations mentioned by him are documented in other sources – the seizing of the Kadmeia at Thebes in 383, the double celebration of the Isthmian games in 390, and the battle which raged between the Eleians and the Arcadians during the course of the Olympia in 364.

The first violation mentioned by Aristides as an infringement of a sacred truce was the Spartan attack on the Theban Kadmeia, or citadel, in 383 BC. The instigator of the attack, the Spartan commander Phoibidas, had undertaken it without orders from Sparta, and the ephors and the majority of the Spartans, according to Xenophon, were angry at what Phoibidas had done. Agesilaos, however, defended his actions, arguing that what Phoibidas had done ought to be judged on the benefits resulting to the state from the seizure of the Kadmeia. Incidentally, the attack occurred while the women were celebrating the Thesmophoria on the Kadmeia.<sup>68</sup>

Aristides mentions that the attack violated the spondai because it occurred during a Pythian year, but the capture of the citadel was not a breaking of the Pythian ekecheiria, as the ekecheiria would not have extended as far as Thebes.<sup>69</sup> Plutarch notes that the Greeks were angry at the action because it had taken place at a time of spondai and peace, but in his account their condemnation of the attack stems from the surreptitious nature of the attack on a peaceful polis, unwary, and in a time of peace throughout Greece, because the King's Peace of 387/6 was in force, rather than from the breaking of a sacred truce.

The Eleusinian truce might never have been broken, but fear of military intervention during the Peloponnesian War compelled the Athenians to give up their annual procession from Athens to Eleusis, after the Spartans occupied Dekeleia in 413, and since then the Athenians had been travelling to Eleusis by sea. It was only when Alkibiades was welcomed back to Athens in 407 as strategos that the normal procession was restored, though only temporarily. On his arrival at Athens, he made speeches in the boule and ekklesia, arguing that he had not been guilty of sacrilege in connec-

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

tion with the Eleusinian Mysteries, and had been unfairly treated, and he was duly elected as supreme commander. Then, as a pointed affirmation of his professed innocence of the charges of sacrilege, he organised the procession to Eleusis. Xenophon gives only a brief account of the incident, but states that Alkibiades led out the troops and conducted the procession to Eleusis by land. Plutarch adds that on this occasion Alkibiades escorted the procession with the infantry through territory which the enemy threatened, had sentries posted on the heights, and an advance guard sent out. The priests, the *mystai* and the *mystagogoi* taking part were guarded by hoplites, and they made their way safely to Eleusis: none of the enemy dared to attack, and, after the ceremonies, the procession also made its way safely back to the city.<sup>70</sup>

Athenian loss of control of their territory had religious implications. The annual incursions of the Spartans in the early stages of the war had not disrupted the religious activity of the polis, but the permanent garrisoning of Dekeleia had, since the Athenians, feeling unsafe by land, had to travel by sea for access to the sacred mysteries. Whether their fears of the Spartans were founded is uncertain, nor can it be determined whether the Spartans would have respected the sanctity of the procession; the Athenians preferred not to test the religious sensibilities of the invaders. Alkibiades' defiant gesture of resurgent Athenian power was presumably not repeated in following years. He himself fell into disgrace, the Athenians into defeat, and it was presumably only in 403, after the Thirty Tyrants had been ousted and the democracy restored, that the procession by land recommenced.

It is also possible that despite the alternative arrangements that were made to travel from Athens to Eleusis by sea, many would-be initiates from throughout Greece were discouraged from travelling to Athens to participate, particularly Greeks from states which were at war with Athens, or Sparta.<sup>71</sup> When news reached Athens in 335 of the destruction of Thebes, Athens' ally, by Alexander the Great, the Greater Mysteries were cancelled through fear of a military attack on Athens.<sup>72</sup>

#### ISTHMIAN COMPETITORS: 'TWICE DEFEATED, TWICE VICTORIOUS'

While there is evidence for the non-observance of the sacred truces on some occasions, some scruples were observed during the long

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

period of internecine struggle of the Peloponnesian War. In 412 a Spartan-led expedition to Chios was organised, but in 411 the Corinthians refused to sail because they were about to celebrate the Isthmian festival. Agis was prepared to allow them to preserve the truce accompanying the festival by taking all the responsibility for the expedition himself, but the Corinthians were nevertheless unwilling to be involved. While Agis could make the expedition without breaking the truce, because truces were not a universal ban on war, the Corinthians, as the sponsors of the truce and celebrants of the festival, could not. Those who were celebrating a festival for which a truce was proclaimed held themselves to be both immune from attack, a condition respected by other states, and bound not to attack others.<sup>73</sup>

The Spartans in 390 under Agesilaos led an invasion of Corinthian territory. Xenophon states that, because it was the month in which the Isthmian festival was being held, Agesilaos went first to the Isthmus where the Argives were offering the sacrifice to Poseidon as part of the celebration of the Isthmian festival being held under their jurisdiction, by virtue of their recent synoikismos, political union, with the Corinthians. When the Argives learned that Agesilaos was on his way, they fled in alarm back to Corinth, leaving behind the animals which they had already sacrificed.

Agesilaos did not pursue the fleeing Argives, but encamped in the sacred precinct, and offered up a sacrifice to the deity. There he remained until the Corinthian exiles with him had also sacrificed and held the Isthmian festival; their desire to do this was due to the fact that the contests were traditionally under Corinthian jurisdiction and the exiles by celebrating them were seeking acceptance as the legitimate rulers of Corinth. This was presumably why Agesilaos had made directly for the Isthmus, and his going there was an act of premeditated intimidation, which was taken seriously enough by the Argives for them to flee. Yet the Argives were not so easily deprived of the directorship of the festival, and once Agesilaos, his Spartans and the exiles had left the Isthmus, the Argives proceeded to celebrate the contests again from the beginning. So in that year, writes Xenophon, some of the competitors were twice defeated, while some were twice victorious.<sup>74</sup>

No harm had come to the competitors or spectators: those who were there on the first day of original sacrifice to Poseidon remained there to celebrate the festival under the direction of the Corinthian exiles, and were still there when the contests were held



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

again by the Argives. When the Argives fled at the approach of the Spartans, the competitors, and those who had come to watch, remained. This was an effective demonstration of the trust which those who had travelled to the festival placed in the *asylia* and *asphaleia* which was guaranteed to them by the sacred truce. The attack on the celebration of the festival was technically a violation of the truce from the Argive point of view, but it is possible that the Spartans did not see it in this light. Agesilaos was contesting the right of the Argives to have jurisdiction over the celebration, and although the Isthmian games were covered by a truce it is possible that he viewed the truce which the Argives had proclaimed as invalid, because authority over Corinth was disputed by the Corinthian exiles supported by Sparta. The Isthmian festival had, according to Pausanias, a continuous history, and even when Corinth which organised it was sacked in 146 by the Roman consul Mummius, the nearby city of Sikyon hosted it, until the Isthmian sanctuary was rebuilt and the Corinthians resumed control.<sup>75</sup> As will be seen with the other pilgrimage destinations, interruptions to the celebration of the Isthmian festival were infrequent and pilgrims could travel there and participate in the celebration of the festival in safety.

#### OLYMPIA: 420 AND 364

Another great panhellenic sanctuary, Olympia, was infrequently the object of contention. Pheidon of Argos' eviction of the Eleians from control of the Olympic festival in the seventh century was described by Herodotos as the greatest act of hubris ever committed by any Greek. In 480 the Olympic festival had proceeded as normal, with the Greeks assembled to watch the contests, apparently oblivious to the Persian threat.<sup>76</sup> During the Peloponnesian War, the Eleians excluded Sparta from participation in the festival because of an alleged violation of the sacred truce. Lepreon had at one stage been in alliance with Elis, but had renounced this agreement, and after the Eleians began to bring pressure to bear on Lepreon to renew it, the city appealed to the Spartans. The Eleians refused to accept Spartan arbitration, being on hostile terms with the Spartans, and they ravaged the land of Lepreon, whereupon Sparta decided that Lepreon was an independent state, and garrisoned it. At the same time the Spartans attacked the Eleian fort Phyrkos, and because the Eleians claimed that this attack had

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

taken place during the Olympic truce they inflicted a fine of 2,000 minas on the Spartans, 2 minas for each hoplite involved.<sup>77</sup>

The amount of the fine levied by the Eleians was laid down by Eleian law, and the Eleians, as the custodians of the Olympic festival, were responsible for levying this fine. The Spartans protested, and claimed that the Olympic truce had not yet been announced in Sparta when the Spartan hoplites had been sent on their mission, but had been proclaimed in Sparta only after the attack had occurred. According to the Eleians, as the truce had been announced in Elis, they had been living as in peacetime when the attack occurred, and had been caught unawares: the Spartans had broken the truce.<sup>78</sup>

The Spartan reply was that there was no point in proclaiming the truce at Sparta after the attack had taken place, if the Eleians believed that the truce was already in existence and the Spartans had broken it by attacking Lepreon. The fact that the Eleians went on to announce the truce after the attack showed, the Spartans argued, that the Eleians did not really believe that the Spartans had broken it. The Eleians remained adamant that it had been broken, but were willing to compromise on the terms that, if the Spartans handed back Lepreon, the Eleians would waive the Spartan fine and that they themselves would pay the god's share of it. When the Spartans rejected this offer the Eleians proposed that the Spartans could retain control of Lepreon, if they were willing to swear an oath, before the assembled Greeks, on the altar of Zeus in the temple, presumably during the Olympic ceremonies, that they would pay the fine at a future date. When the Spartans still refused, they were not allowed access to the temple, and had to sacrifice at home. A similar incident arose in 332 BC when the Athenians refused to pay a fine imposed by the Eleians, and boycotted the Olympic festival, until the Delphic priestess proclaimed that no further oracles would be given at Delphi to Athenians unless they paid the fine.<sup>79</sup>

All of the Greeks, except for the Spartans and the people of Lepreon, took part in the Olympic festival of 420. The Eleians, however, kept their young men under arms because they feared that the Spartans would use force in order to sacrifice at Olympia, and were supported by 1,000 Argives and the same number of Mantineians, as well as some Athenian cavalry who were waiting at Harpine, near Olympia, for the festival. Bugh suggests that the cavalry may have been there because they had acted as an escort

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

for the Athenians participating in the festival, or perhaps were participants themselves. An escort for participants is otherwise unattested, and would indicate a lack of confidence in the *spondai* for the festival.<sup>80</sup>

The Eleian attitude is interesting in that they went so far as to offer to allow Sparta to retain Lepreon, which the latter had secured by installing a garrison during the sacred truce. It is almost as if they accepted that the Spartans were in some degree in the right in this matter, although they had, nevertheless, violated the truce while it was in force since it had been proclaimed in Elis. On the other hand, even if the Spartans did not know, or claimed not to know, that the truce was in force, the Eleians believed that they ought to be punished in some way for the infringement. It is obvious that the Eleians feared the Spartans, as their attempts to compromise, and their military state of preparedness during the festival, indicate. The approximate time of the proclamation of the truce in Elis would necessarily have been known to the Spartans, and they would also have become aware of it as they passed through Elis even if they did not already know that it was in force. The truce in Elis meant that any troop movements were violations of this and it was the responsibility of aggressors, the Eleians seem to be arguing, to ensure that they were not contravening it. On the other hand, there was no real point in announcing the truce in other states if it was expected that the truce would be observed by other states as soon as it had been proclaimed at Elis. If Sparta had attacked after the truce had been proclaimed in Sparta that would have been a clear breach of the truce and this is accepted by the Spartans. The crux of the argument is the point at which a sacred truce came into force, and whether all states were bound by it from the time of the proclamation in the host-state or only from the time of its proclamation in their own state.

The fear of Spartan military action was exacerbated by an incident involving a Spartan, Lichas, who had entered his two-horse chariot in a race, and won. Since the Spartans had no right to enter, after being debarred by the Eleians, the victory was announced in the name of the Boeotian people. Lichas, in what must be described as a provocative act deliberately intended to defy the Eleian prohibition, came out into the stadium, and crowned the charioteer, in order to indicate that the chariot was owned by him, Lichas, a Spartan. The Eleian judges gave him an immediate beating. This

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

gave rise to Eleian fears that the Spartans might attack, but these misgivings about Spartan intentions were unfounded as no hostile move was made. Xenophon writes that Lichas was beaten although he was an old man. Gomme, perhaps unnecessarily, suggests from this that he may have been a member of the *gerousia*, the Spartan council of old men, which if it were the case 'would increase the fear of Spartan intervention'. Xenophon includes this as one of the causes, and Pausanias gives it as the sole reason, for Agis' later invasion of Elis. Pausanias writes that in his own day the Eleian records showed not Lichas as the winner, but the demos of Thebes.<sup>81</sup>

That the Spartans did not disturb the games at the time was perhaps as much due to genuine religious scruples as to the Eleian military preparations with their Argive, Mantineian and Athenian supporters for an attack by the Spartans. The Spartans had their revenge later, after the Peloponnesian War had ended, when they attacked and defeated Elis in 399, never having paid the fine. A battle occurred in the Altis area, the most sacred part of Olympia. However, the Spartans allowed Elis to continue to control the festival as there was no other state suitable for this role, and from 396 (the next celebration) they competed in the Olympic festival once again, the fact that they had refused to pay the fine having excluded them from the festival for nearly thirty years (424–396).<sup>82</sup>

In 365 the Eleians captured the town of Lasion, a former possession, which had joined the Arcadian alliance. When the Eleians and the Arcadians met in battle, the former were defeated. The Arcadians, after capturing all the cities of the Akrorians except one, took possession of Olympia and marched against Elis itself but were driven off. The Arcadians retained control of Olympia, and after strengthening their garrison there, decided to organise the Olympic festival due to be celebrated in the following year in conjunction with the Pisans, who maintained a claim that they had been the original guardians of the shrine. There is no reference to the sending out of *spondophoroi* for announcing the Olympic festival. This was the duty of the Eleians, and it is almost certain that they did not dispatch any, with Olympia in enemy hands, and the Arcadian intention to hold the games under their own auspices clear. Whether the Arcadians made any arrangements for announcing the festival is uncertain.

When Xenophon states that the Arcadians prepared to celebrate the Olympics with the Pisans, this does not mean that these

were the only two groups to participate. Rather, the point seems to be that the Pisans, with their claim that they were the original organisers of the games, were to join with the Arcadians in organising the celebration of the games. That the festival was now in non-Eleian hands does not seem to have discouraged entries, and competitors arrived as usual.

When the festival had commenced, the Eleians with the Achaeans as their allies marched towards Olympia. The wrestling competition was in progress as the Eleians entered the sacred precinct, and a battle ensued between the Eleians and the Arcadians who had as allies 2,000 Argive hoplites, and 400 Athenian cavalry. Once the Eleians had attacked, a full-scale battle ensued throughout the sanctuary, and after a hard day's fighting in which the Eleians had the upper hand, the Arcadians at night built a stockade. The Eleians, on the next day, seeing the stockade, departed to their own polis, and probably did not regain control of Olympia until after the battle of Mantinea in 362.

What happened to the competitors and any pilgrims who had attended the sacrifice to Zeus and remained to watch the games is unclear from the account of Xenophon; if they had stayed out of the area of the fighting they may well have been safe, but anyone caught in the *mêlée* would have been at risk. Diodoros states that while the battle took place those who had come to the games, wearing their festival wreaths, watched from a point of safety applauding the 'manly' deeds of both sides. This is suspiciously akin to a dramatic flourish, but what really suggests that Diodoros' account is unhistorical is the awkward error which Diodoros makes in having the Eleians celebrating the games when the Arcadians allied with the Pisans attacked, and having the victorious Arcadians proceed to hold the rest of the competitions.<sup>83</sup>

It may seem strange that the Eleians attacked actually during the festival, but if no *spondophoroi* had been sent out to announce the approach of the games and the commencement of the sacred truce then these particular games of 364 were not under sacred protection of any kind. This meant, from the Eleian point of view, that they had not defiled the site by their action. Moreover, in their eyes, control of the games had been wrested from them by an invasion of their territory and the seizing of Olympia, and the Arcadian recourse to a garrison at the site was an admission of illegal control. Perhaps the Eleians could have held off until after the festival, but that was the best time to attack, as the

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

Arcadians were preoccupied, and the Eleians themselves were determined to wrest back their traditional role as organisers. Significantly, the popularity of the Olympics does not seem to have suffered from the incident. Because the Aetolians held the passes around Delphi, Demetrios Poliorketes conducted the Pythian festival in Athens in 290, a move which Plutarch describes as 'revolutionary'.<sup>84</sup>

The safety of individual pilgrims at Olympia could also be threatened as in 388/7, when Lysias in a speech against the Sicilian tyrant Dionysios whipped up the crowd to such an extent that they destroyed the tents of the *theoria* which had been sent by the tyrant to participate in the festival.<sup>85</sup> There is no mention of the authorities taking action against the pilgrims who had in this way degenerated into a mob, and it is probable that against such a crowd the authorities were powerless. Political riots at Olympia were presumably rare, though there might have been a similar incident involving members of Hiero's *theoria* in the fifth century, in which Themistokles is stated to have reacted angrily to the richness of the decoration of the *theoria*'s tent, and to have urged the Greeks to tear it down. The similarity between the two stories, however, suggests that the opposition of Themistokles to Hiero is a fabrication based on the fourth-century incident: even though the incidents are separated by a number of decades, and the fate of Dionysios' *theoria* need not necessarily have put future dynasts on their guard, the possibility of a 'doubler' fashioned for political purposes should perhaps be considered.<sup>86</sup> The authorities at cult centres were presumably empowered to deal with individual offenders, but it is possible that in political cases such as these the authorities simply had to overlook the situation. Such disputes at a sacred site could endanger pilgrims, while conflict over the political control of a sanctuary could also threaten their safety.

#### THE ARGIVE SPONDAI

In 387 the Spartans decided to invade Argos, whereupon the Argives proclaimed a truce, *spondai*, for a festival (which Xenophon does not name) in order to ward off hostilities. Agesipolis, the Spartan king in charge of the campaign, travelled to Olympia to consult the oracle there as to whether the truce, *spondai*, ought to be accepted since the Argives had proclaimed it, not when due, but simply to ensure a truce throughout Argos so that

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

none could invade their territory (the Argives were accustomed to do this in response to threats of Spartan invasion). After receiving a favourable reply at Olympia, Agesipolis also went to Delphi and consulted the oracle there: Apollo was asked if he was of the same opinion as his father Zeus, and he was.

Consequently, although the Spartans were aware that the Argives were manipulating the calendar so that the truce of the festival would be in force when they attacked, they were still scrupulous in seeking religious sanction from Zeus and Apollo before invading Argos when a truce had been proclaimed. The Argives' approach to the spondai of their festivals makes it clear that they considered that a state which had declared a truce could neither go to war or be warred against.<sup>87</sup> When they realised that the Spartans could not be prevented from invading, they sent two garlanded heralds alleging that a truce, spondai, was in force. Agesipolis spoke to the heralds, stating that the gods did not consider the Argives to have justly proclaimed a sacred truce, and refused to acknowledge the spondai.<sup>88</sup> Pritchett takes the festival to be the Karneia, on the grounds that the Argives in the fifth century are known to have manipulated their calendar for the opposite purpose, to delay the sacred period of the Karneia, so that military activity would be possible; Parker, however, prefers the Nemean festival.<sup>89</sup> But as Xenophon stresses manipulation of the calendar, the Karneia is the more likely candidate, as manipulating the spondai for a panhellenic festival which attracted pilgrims from throughout Greece at a set time in the year would be more difficult.

#### DELPHI AND THE SACRED WARS

Delphi as the main oracular site in Greece was in the unfortunate position of being a bone of political contention for several centuries. In the realm of the mythical past the Phylegyans were wiped out by the god Apollo because of their attack on the Delphic sanctuary.<sup>90</sup> Several wars, known as Sacred Wars,<sup>91</sup> were fought over the site: and for this the important political roles both of the oracle and of control of the Amphictyonic Council were responsible. The first of these wars is the most interesting in this context. The city of Kirrha (Krisa), near Delphi, was a port at which many of the pilgrims to the oracle disembarked. Apparently the polis exploited its geographical position, and pilgrims to Delphi complained that Kirrha was extorting money from them, by

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

imposing taxes on those on their way to visit the temple at Delphi. Delphi made a complaint to the Amphictyonic League, and Athens took a leading part in urging the declaration of war upon Kirrha. The war which is dated to 595–591 ended with the destruction of Kirrha and the dedication of its territory, the Krisaia plain, to the god Apollo. It was forbidden for this land to be cultivated; but even more significantly Delphi passed into the jurisdiction of the Amphictyonic League, resulting in the war ending to the advantage of the pilgrims as they were relieved of the pilgrim toll.<sup>92</sup> It has been argued that the First Sacred War was a myth invented by the Macedonians in the 340s and 330s to justify the Fourth Sacred War, but Isocrates in the 370s mentions the First Sacred War.<sup>93</sup>

The Second Sacred War of 449 involved the Spartans ejecting the Phokians from control of Delphi and handing it back to the Delphians: this presupposes that the Phokians had seized the sanctuary. The Athenians, champions of the Phokians, did not intervene at this point but immediately after the Spartans had left recaptured Delphi and handed it back to the Phokians.<sup>94</sup> (The Delphians presumably reasserted their independence soon after.) The military actions of both Spartans and Athenians were quick and effective and there is no evidence that they affected pilgrims consulting the oracle. In contrast, the Third Sacred War lasted for a decade, from 356 to 346, and was a particularly bitter struggle, in which the Phokians stripped the treasures of Delphi in order to pay for the mercenaries which they had hired to help them fight the war against the Delphic Amphictyony. While the Phokians had been accused of cultivating the sacred plain, the war was clearly political in origin. Pilgrimage activity can only have been hindered by the struggle for the control of Delphi, and individuals from states hostile to the Phokians presumably would not have attempted a pilgrimage to Delphi, while potential consultants from non-hostile states may well have been deterred by the existence of hostilities,<sup>95</sup> as in the Peloponnesian War.

The Fourth Sacred War in 339 was short. The Athenians were accused in the Amphictyony of impiety by the Amphissans; Aeschines, representing the Athenians, reacted with a counter charge that the Amphissans had been cultivating the sacred Krisaia plain, dedicated to the god Apollo in the First Sacred War. The next day the Amphictyony attacked Amphissan houses and port facilities on the sacred plain. A few months later the war was renewed, but



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

was overshadowed by the alliance made between Athens and Thebes and the resulting conflict with Philip at Chaironeia in 338. There is no evidence that this sacred war affected pilgrims to any degree.<sup>96</sup> The First Sacred War relieved the pilgrims of a financial imposition, the second and fourth do not seem to have concerned them. Only the third may have affected their safety and visits to the oracular site, due to the length of the conflict and the very real nature of the hostilities.

The main threats to Delphi apart from the Sacred Wars came from barbarians, the Persians in 480–479 and the Gauls in 279, and from powerful individuals, Jason of Pherai and Perseus of Macedon. Supernatural intervention ‘saved’ Delphi from barbarian attack in 480–479 and in 279. When the Delphians consulted the oracle in 480 about what to do with the temple treasures, they received a reply that the god would look after them himself. Weapons came out of the temple of their own accord. As the Persians approached there were thunderbolts, rocks (which Herodotos says could still be seen in his own day) fell from Parnassos, a battle-cry came from the temple and two giant soldiers – local heroes – cut down the Persians who were now fleeing.<sup>97</sup>

Two centuries later, the Gallic invasion of Greece led to an attack on Delphi in 279 BC, and the sanctuary was threatened with destruction; the Delphians sought the advice of the god, whose oracular response was that they were not to be afraid as the god would protect his own. Thunder, lightning and earthquake struck the ground occupied by the Gauls’ army. Ancient heroes put in an appearance; at night, frost, snow, and great rocks from Parnassos fell on the attackers. The next day the Greeks attacked, the Gauls were put to flight, and during that night fear and madness came upon them, so that, dividing into two groups, each imagining the other to be the Greeks, they slaughtered one another. The Greeks pursued the survivors, effecting a massacre, so that it was claimed that no Gauls escaped alive.<sup>98</sup>

In 370 BC, Jason of Pherai, tagos (commander) of the Thessalians, requested the various cities under his influence to contribute sacrificial animals for the approaching Pythian festival, and ordered the Thessalians to prepare for war, because he intended to take over jurisdiction of the Pythian festival. His assassination cut short any such plans.<sup>99</sup>

A more serious threat than Jason occurred in the second century BC, when Perseus, son of Philip V, abrogated his father’s treaty

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

with the Romans, and set about recreating a Macedonian empire. A contemporary document which was engraved and set up at Delphi gives the Roman charges against Perseus. It was clearly propagandist in motivation, an attempt to convince Delphi, and presumably the Amphictyonic Council and the Greek world in general, that Roman action against Perseus was justifiable, and that the Greek cities should rally behind Rome, instead of the Macedonian king. Among other charges, the inscription states that Perseus, 'contrary to what was fitting', brought his army to Delphi during the Pythian truce, and also participated in the oracular rituals, the sacrifices, the contests, and the Amphictyonic Council, though this should not have happened, coming as he did with an army. His conduct was all the more heinous because he also called in the barbarians from across the Danube, who had previously invaded Delphi, to come to his aid.

Perseus had also plotted to assassinate Eumenes, King of Pergamon, friend and ally of the Romans. Eumenes had addressed the Roman senate in 172 bc for the purpose of warning the Romans of Perseus' territorial ambitions, being motivated by his own desire to ensure that Perseus would not cross into Asia Minor. Perseus' alleged assassination attempt, so the Roman version continues, actually took place at Delphi, disregarding the safety which the god (Apollo) gave to all who arrived at his shrine, and also the fact that the sanctity and the inviolability of the polis of the Delphians had been recognised by all men, both by Greeks and by barbarians for all time.<sup>100</sup>

It was, however, merely Roman propaganda to state that historically the asyilia of the shrine had always been observed up to this point; in stating this the Romans were glossing over the Gallic attack on the shrine which occurred in the third century. Nevertheless it helps to indicate the attitude of the Greeks to asyilia, for the Romans were clearly trying to create prejudice against the Macedonians by stressing the inviolability of the shrine and the protection the god granted to all who went there. Nevertheless, pilgrimage to Delphi had been affected by sacred wars, barbarian invasion, and Macedonian seizure, due in each case to the political importance of the site, and Pausanias notes that Delphi had been the victim of numerous attacks, down even to the time of Nero, due to its wealth and importance.<sup>101</sup> However, given that the oracle was in operation for several centuries, the attacks on Delphi were

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

relatively few, and pilgrims seeking to consult the oracle must have remained relatively unaffected by these incidents.

#### THE PERIPATETIC NEMEAN FESTIVAL

The worst case of maltreatment of pilgrims was the incident arising out of the double celebration of the Nemean festival in 235, when Aratos of Sikyon was fighting at the river Khares, against the tyrant Aristippos of Argos, for control of that city. Aratos brought the polis of Kleonai into the Achaean league (traditionally, Kleonai had jurisdiction over the Nemean festival, with Kleonai under Argive domination). He organised the Nemean festival to be celebrated in that polis, claiming that it had 'an ancestral and more fitting claim to it' than did Argos. However, the Argives, his enemies, also made arrangements to celebrate the festival at Argos, where it had been held for some time. Aratos, however, did not accept the validity of this festival, and treated as enemies all of the contestants at the Argive Nemean contests who were caught crossing through Achaean territory, and sold them into slavery. Plutarch states that this was the first time in which the *asylia* and the *asphaleia* (safety) which was granted to contestants had been broken. It is not clear whether he means the first time in the history of the Nemea, or in the history of any of the great religious festivals which involved contests.<sup>102</sup>

If his statement is intended in a universal sense, then it is a clear testimony to the degree to which the Greeks respected the *asylia* and *asphaleia* conferred by the provisions of the sacred truces. However, several incidents had in fact occurred which make it clear that *asylia* of pilgrims was not always observed: the members of Dionysios' *theoria* and possibly that of Hiero were attacked; Phrynon was captured; and Lichas was ill-treated, though technically not entitled to *asylia* since Spartans were excluded from the festival. But Aratos deliberately victimised innocent competitors, so that the violation of the truce was more severe.

As the alternative Nemean festival suggests, the history of the Nemean games was chequered. It has been argued that Corinth assumed control of the Nemean festival some time after the collapse of Argos as a Peloponnesian power (the Spartan king Kleomenes I weakened Argos by killing 6,000 Argive hoplites, at an uncertain date during his reign, c. 520–490), and that this was prompted partly by Corinth's need to maintain her status as one

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

of the three main states (Sparta, Athens and Corinth). However, this period of Corinthian control rests on the evidence of two scholiasts on Pindar, and must remain hypothetical. In any case, Corinthian control of the festival would have been short-lived, for Argos was in control of the festival in 468, as in this year Mycenae was destroyed by Argos, and one of Mycenae's disagreements with Argos was over Argive control of the Nemean contests.<sup>103</sup>

The fourth-century temple at Nemea was built over the remains of the original sixth-century temple which was clearly destroyed by fire: blocks from the temple are blackened with fire, and there are tiles warped by intense heat. Numerous bronze arrowheads, iron spear points and butts have been discovered amongst the debris from the earlier temple, indicating that a battle took place at the temple, probably in the last quarter of the fifth century BC. There is a dearth of artefacts from the first half of the fourth century indicating that the biennial festival was not held at Nemea during this time. It is possible that the removal of the contests from Nemea to Argos took place as a result of this battle in the fifth century.

That the Nemean festival returned to Nemea in the 330s is clear from the archaeological record after an absence of artefacts from the intervening period. This return was probably occasioned by the creation of the League of Corinth, which was to meet each year at a panhellenic festival site; the various coins of Philip and Alexander found at the Nemean sanctuary reflect the return of the festival to Nemea. A great deal of building activity took place in the late fourth century, with the construction of the xenon (a building for official guests), bath, stadium and in particular the temple of Zeus. The festival, however, returned to Argos, probably in the 270s, and when Aratos re-established the festival at Nemea in 235 it was in competition with the Nemean festival the Argives held at Argos. When Aratos later became an ally of Argos, the Nemean festival was held only at Argos.<sup>104</sup> There, in 229 BC, his enemy Kleomenes II deliberately took advantage of the festival to make a successful surprise attack on the city, which was full of the 'festival crowd and spectators'.<sup>105</sup>

As with Olympia in the fifth and fourth centuries, control of a panhellenic sanctuary was prestigious, important in political terms, and was obviously thought of as a reflection of political strength: Argos, perhaps Corinth, and Mycenae all wished to control the site as a reflection of their status as important cities. Argos' interest

in Nemea is to be seen in this context, and in its earlier attempt, under Pheidon, to dominate the Olympic festival: when this proved untenable, Argos looked closer to home, to the Nemean festival.

### THE 'WAGON-ROLLERS': OFFICIALS IN DANGER

Amongst the Megarians was a clan (*genos*) referred to as the 'wagon-rollers': a *theoria* of Peloponnesians, with their wives and children, passing through the Megarid on its way to Delphi camped in Aigeiroi beside the lake. A group of drunken Megarians pushed the wagons into the lake, so that many of the *theoroi* were drowned. This was during a period of the 'unbridled democracy' at Megara, according to Plutarch, so that the Megarians themselves did not punish the offenders. But the Delphic Amphictyons sentenced some of them to death and exiled others: their descendants were called the 'wagon-rollers'.<sup>106</sup>

In one particular incident in the late fourth century, Ephesian *theoroi* who had come to Sardis to present robes to the goddess Artemis found themselves under attack, for an unknown reason, from the local population. The beasts which they had brought for sacrifice were taken from them and the *theoroi* were maltreated. The local authorities took the matter seriously, and those who had committed the offence received the maximum sentence: death was meted out to the forty-five offenders, who were found guilty of having behaved impiously towards the shrine and hubristically towards the *theoroi*.<sup>107</sup> The local authorities clearly regarded the assault on the *theoroi* as impiety; the *theoroi* had travelled to Sardis to carry out religious duties, and the offenders were dealt with as having committed a religious offence. In one case, *theoroi* were executed by their home-state because they were implicated in the bribing of the Delphic oracle.<sup>108</sup>

When Kos introduced a panhellenic festival for Asklepios in the third century, it sent out *theoroi* to various Greek states in order to announce the new celebration. The two *theoroi* who announced the celebration at Philippi may possibly have experienced some danger in carrying out their mission, for the decree of Philippi recorded that this polis accepted the invitation, and also made arrangements that the *theoroi* be escorted to the next polis which they were visiting, Nea Polis. The escort was apparently not for ceremonial purposes, because the strategoi were instructed to send

#### THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

soldiers with the theoroi to Nea Polis, in order that the theoroi might travel safely.<sup>109</sup> No reason except that of their safe-conduct is provided. It is possible that some incident on the way to this polis led to this offer of assistance, or that the polis of Philippi knew that the route between the two poleis was unsafe. What happened in subsequent penteteric years when other Koan theoroi arrived to announce that the festival was about to be celebrated is unknown, and the polis of Philippi may have continued to provide the escort, or the problem of 'safety' may no longer have been relevant. The gods themselves were considered to protect theoroi: when the people of Helike seized the Ionian theoroi who had come to sacrifice, their city was destroyed by earthquake and tidal wave.<sup>110</sup>

Myths also reflect the violence which theoroi might encounter. At Kleonai, near Nemea, there was a sanctuary and tomb of Eurytos and Kteatos: it was said that as theoroi from Elis going to the contests at Nemea they were killed by Herakles, who claimed that they were his enemies.<sup>111</sup>

#### THE ROMANS AND ASYLIA

By the beginning of the second century BC the Greek world was becoming a part of the Roman world, and Roman activities against the Macedonians brought the Greeks under Roman protection. During the time of the Roman protectorate over Greece, and after the complete annexation of the Greek Mediterranean world, Romans played an increasing role in the affairs of the Greeks. In the religious sphere, the Romans came to guarantee the asyilia of various sacred sites, and in 191 the oracle at Delphi was freed from Aetolian domination. In 189 the Roman senate passed a *senatus consultum* about Delphian affairs, which was to verify arrangements which had been made in 191 when the site first came under Roman 'supervision',<sup>112</sup> and guaranteed the asyilia of the site. This was the first of various occasions when asyilia was guaranteed by the Romans.

The Romans became the guarantors of asyilia, but in coming to dominate Greece were to render asyilia a concept of increasingly limited significance, for the Romans were not simply guarantors but became dominators. When the *pax Romana* held sway over Greece and the Greek East, there were no more wars, powerful cities or aggressive monarchs against whom sacred sites required

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the observance of asyilia as a deterrent. In the reign of the Roman emperor Tiberius, the status of asyilia as claimed by various Greek sacred sites came under review. While this asyilia will have largely been meaningless in that there was no danger of sacred sites being attacked by their neighbours under the *pax Romana*, asyilia clearly had the value of being a religious distinction, in that the sites which had this asyilia were distinguished from those without it, and marked them out as being more important than other sacred sites.

The investigation under Tiberius arose from the abuse of asyilia within local contexts: the temples of Greek cities were filled with runaway slaves and with debtors, taking advantage of the temples' asyilia. Accordingly, the senate held an investigation into which sanctuaries had a right to asyilia. Some of the cities involved voluntarily gave up their claim to it, others sent representatives to Rome to argue their case. So many claims had to be investigated that the senators grew weary of their task, and handed it over to the consuls.<sup>113</sup> By the first century AD it was clearly an honour if the Roman authorities accepted the asyilia of a particular sacred site, but as a religious and political phenomenon it no longer retained any significance as a bulwark against military aggression.

#### CONCLUSION

The safety of pilgrims in the Greek world was linked with the general adherence to the provisions of the various sacred truces which operated in the Greek world, for a religious occasion in itself could not guarantee the safety of the participants. It was the panhellenic nature of various festivals that inspired truces which would enable all Greeks to participate if they wished. The fact that there were sacred truces implies that they were thought to be necessary for the well-being of pilgrims and the success of festivals, as well as giving an official framework and formality to the celebrations. By and large, however, the sanctity of sacred sites does seem to have held good. Greek pilgrims did not have to contend with the problems of Christian pilgrims, for they had to face no Muslims and the like, hostile to pilgrims on principle. The worst that pilgrims had to fear was their fellow Greeks, and on occasion barbarian incursions such as the Gauls in the third century. The fact that truces, the inviolability of sacred sites, and the safety of those attending were generally if not always observed helps to

THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

account for the continuing popularity of the major religious festivals and for pilgrimage as a popular institution in the Greek world.



### 3

## PILGRIMAGE DESTINATIONS I: MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

Pilgrimages fall into two broad categories, which will be dealt with in this and the following chapter. In this chapter the pilgrimages which involved the pilgrims seeking a solution to a specific problem are examined. Soliciting an oracle to gain the god's approval of or to confirm a course of action, becoming initiated in the hope of obtaining a better hereafter, or attending a healing sanctuary in order to be cured were pilgrimages in which the worshippers had a specific objective in mind. Mystery cults, healing sanctuaries and oracles were much frequented for more than a millennium by Greek pilgrims in search of divine guidance and assistance.

### MYSTERY CELEBRATIONS

Mystery celebrations were common throughout Greece, involving secret rites in honour of various deities and several of these celebrations were of more than local importance. The Eleusinian Mysteries were associated with agriculture but their popularity seems largely based on the promise of a better afterlife for the initiates. Other important mystery cults were held at Andania and Lykosoura, though with less panhellenic appeal. The main requirements of these cults were ritual purity and silence.

### Eleusis

The Eleusinian Mysteries were basically an agrarian cult which developed by the classical period into a cult which promised a

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

better afterlife. The mysteries were very popular in classical, hellenistic and Roman times, and might have had Mycenaean origins. Athenian men and women, non-Athenians, and slaves all participated; only non-Greek speakers, murderers, and the polluted were debarred. The mysteries were one of Athens' great gifts to Greek civilisation.<sup>1</sup> According to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, after Hades abducted Persephone to the underworld through a chasm which opened up and into which a nearby herd of pigs also fell, her mother Demeter scoured the earth, unsuccessfully, for her daughter. Coming to rest at Eleusis, she was treated with kindness by King Keleos and his family. Head veiled, she accepted a seat on a stool over which Iambe, one of Keleos' daughters, threw a fleece, and refused food and drink until Iambe made her laugh. She declined red wine, but ordered them to make her a drink, the kykeon, made of barley meal, penny-royal and water. After many weeks Demeter withdrew to a temple she had commanded to be built. In her misery over Persephone, she withdrew her gift of fertility from the soil, 'hiding the seed under the earth' (so that it would not grow). Zeus, alarmed that the gods would not be honoured if their worshippers perished, persuaded Hades to release Persephone, but Hades gave her a pomegranate seed to eat, meaning that even though she returned to her mother, she had to spend a third part of the year under the ground. Consequently, each year Demeter withholds her favour for a third of the year, and the 'seed lies hidden in the ground', in the autumn when it is sown in readiness for spring. In gratitude to the Eleusinians, Demeter showed them her secret rites, and Triptolemos, a son of Keleos, set out to teach the art of agriculture to the world.<sup>2</sup>

The Eleusinian Mysteries were amongst the most important and popular religious celebrations of a panhellenic nature, and they remained so from at least the beginning of the classical period until the demise of paganism. This is one of the reasons why they attracted so much polemical attention from Christian writers. Pilgrims travelled from all over the Greek world, and later from the Roman, in order to be initiated at Eleusis. Even the Athenian initiates themselves were pilgrims, spending a day travelling from Athens, and several nights away from their homes. To be an initiate was to be a *mystes* and undergo initiation (*myesis*); the term *telete* was also used of the initiation ceremony.<sup>3</sup> At Eleusis, as with other religious centres, there were contests, with the festival of the Eleusinia held every four years, attracting competitors from

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

throughout Greece, including Opous (in eastern Lokri, north of Boeotia), Corinth and Thebes.<sup>4</sup>

Little is known about the Lesser Eleusinian Mysteries which took place at Agrai, outside the walls of Athens in the month of Anthesterion (February and March); even the precise dates of the celebration are unknown. The Lesser Mysteries seem to have involved fasting, and the main theme of the celebration may have been that of purification.<sup>5</sup>

The Greater Mysteries took place in the month of Boedromion (September and October) at Eleusis.<sup>6</sup> On the thirteenth day of Boedromion, the ephebes (a corps of 18- and 19-year olds in military training) journeyed to Eleusis, and on the fourteenth they escorted the sacred objects from Eleusis to the Eleusinion at Athens: these sacred objects, *hiera*, were stored in chests known as *kistai*. The *hiera* went by carriage escorted by the Eleusinian priestesses, but as the bridge at the Rheitoi streams was only 5 feet wide and so unsuitable for carts, the priestesses carried the *kistai* across the Rheitoi at this point, as they would on their return journey. The return of the *kistai* to Eleusis formed the focus of the procession which took place on the nineteenth of Boedromion.<sup>7</sup>

The first day of the Greater Mysteries in which initiates played a part was the fifteenth day of Boedromion, known as the *agyrrhos*, 'gathering'. The archon *basileus* summoned the initiates to the Painted Stoa. The hierophant (revealer of the *hiera*, the sacred objects) and the *dadouchos* (torch-bearer) were present, and the *hierokeryx* (sacred herald) read out a proclamation (*prorrhesis*) inviting participation in the mysteries. This proclamation debarred those of barbarous tongue and those who were polluted from participation. According to Isocrates, the Persians were excluded because of their attacks on Greece, but the emphasis on the initiates being able to speak Greek appears to have been an important feature of the ceremony, and may not have wholly been due to Athenian hostility towards their non-Greek enemies, the Persians.<sup>8</sup> The most important factor for an initiate was the ability to understand the explanations accompanying the rituals, and there is the story of the man who had a dream that he was initiated into the mysteries but, because in the dream he could not hear clearly the words spoken by the hierophant, was not considered to have been initiated.<sup>9</sup>

On the second day the pilgrims took part in a pilgrimage from

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

Athens to the sea, with cries of 'to the sea, *mystai*!' <sup>10</sup> Here they washed a piglet which they had each brought with them, and probably themselves; <sup>11</sup> this piglet was later sacrificed, probably on the same day as this journey to the sea, rather than at Eleusis. As the initiates were from all classes of society, the sacrifice to Demeter had to be one which was within economic reach of all, and just as Asklepios accepted the lowly chicken Demeter accepted the piglet, which was relatively cheap and easy to raise or acquire. <sup>12</sup>

What happened on the days of the seventeenth and eighteenth of Boedromion is uncertain; the day of the Epidauria occurred on one of these, but it is not known which. <sup>13</sup> One of the days was called 'Hither the Victims', which implies sacrificial acts. On the day of the Epidauria the initiates stayed indoors, probably in preparation for the major events of the next few days. <sup>14</sup> When the god Asklepios was introduced to Athens in 420/19 from Epidaurus, he was housed by the goddesses at Eleusis until he was established in his own shrine at Athens, and part of the story was that Asklepios was late for the celebration of the mysteries, so what had taken place so far was performed again in order that he might participate. <sup>15</sup>

The fifth day was the day of the trek from Athens to Eleusis, a distance of some 22 kilometres, and for those in the procession this would have been a pilgrimage of a day's duration. <sup>16</sup> The sacred objects removed from Eleusis on the fourteenth were now returned on the nineteenth, <sup>17</sup> accompanied this time by those seeking initiation in the cult; the ephebes were once again responsible for conducting the *hierai*. <sup>18</sup> The priests and priestesses took the *kistai* from the Eleusinion and they journeyed along the Panathenaic Way, through the agora and on to the Dipylon gate and the *Iakcheion*. The statue of *Iakchos* in that shrine was taken out, and a priest, the *iakchagogos*, accompanied it in a carriage at the front of the procession. <sup>19</sup> The initiates may have joined this procession at the *Pompeion* near the Dipylon gate.

This was unquestionably the largest procession ever to be assembled for a religious purpose in the Greek world, and which occurred on an annual basis for about 1,000 years. Herodotos tells the story of how in 480 during the second Persian invasion a vision was seen of a cloud of dust, as might have been caused by 30,000 men on the march, rising from Eleusis, accompanied by the singing of the *Iakchos* hymn as if the initiates in the Eleusinian Mysteries were making their procession; the noise sounded like

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the voice of the throng making its way to Eleusis.<sup>20</sup> The Periklean telesterion held only about 3,000; Herodotos' number of 30,000 might then be either an exaggeration, or represent the total number of initiates in the city which would indicate that most of the male population of Athens was initiated.<sup>21</sup> Like other mystery celebrations, participation in the cult itself was voluntary, open to anyone whether Athenian or a Greek from elsewhere. However, it appears from the fact that Demonax the Cynic did not become an initiate and that this was one of the accusations in a prosecution brought against him, that all or most other Athenian males were Eleusinian initiates.<sup>22</sup>

The Iakchic chant is known from Aristophanes' *Frogs*, where the happy initiates chant: 'Iakch' o Iakche, Iakch' o Iakche.'<sup>23</sup> Presumably most made the journey on foot, though others would have gone by cart, until c. 338–326, when Lykourgos prohibited this. The Niinnion tablet shows initiates carrying staves and bundles wrapped in cloth tied to a stick and carried over the shoulder, timeless attributes of the traveller, presumably containing provisions, and perhaps clothes for the initiation ceremony.<sup>24</sup> The initiates were also garlanded.<sup>25</sup>

The procession took the route called the 'Sacred Road', usually referred to by modern scholars as the 'Sacred Way',<sup>26</sup> which started from the Dipylon gate, going by the gymnasium of the Academy, going through the pass between Aigaleos and Mount Poikilon, and reaching the shrine of Pythian Apollo (the site of the Byzantine church at Daphni). They then proceeded down to the bay of Eleusis, which they skirted, crossing the streams known as the Rheitoi (sacred to Demeter and Kore (Persephone)), and later the Eleusinian river Kephisos. At the Rheitoi streams the ceremony of the krokosis would take place. The descendants of Krokon, according to myth the first dweller in the area, would tie a saffron coloured ribbon to the right hand and left leg of each of the mystai. A ceremony of purification by washing also took place here.<sup>27</sup>

As the initiates crossed a bridge over one of the streams, important Athenians amongst them were subjected to abuse, mockery and obscene gestures in the gephyrismos rite.<sup>28</sup> That there is a link between Iambe's jesting, which was an aischrologia involving obscene jests, and this gephyrismos rite seems almost certain.<sup>29</sup> It was presumably with Demeter's sufferings that the initiates identified in this ritual act, and they were cheered up, like

her, by buffoonery. Diodoros points out that during the celebration of the rites of Demeter amongst the Sicilians those participating spoke coarsely towards each other, just as Demeter, although distressed by the rape of Persephone, laughed at the jests of Iambe.<sup>30</sup> The apotropaic nature of jesting is clear, as it drove away Demeter's cares and worries; in the same way, the insults, aimed at important Athenians, would have entertained all those crossing the bridge, who left behind the care and worry of the profane world.<sup>31</sup> Aspects of the Eleusinian Mysteries were clearly a re-enactment of the Demeter–Persephone myth.<sup>32</sup> Plutarch refers to an acclamation at a crossing of the bridge in connection with the Eleusinian Mysteries: 'Cross the bridge, O Kore, before it is time to begin the threefold ploughing.' This seems to relate to the agricultural nature of the mysteries.<sup>33</sup>

The night of the nineteenth was presumably spent in general celebration after the long journey from Athens. The day of the twentieth gave the pilgrims a chance to rest, with the central rite of the mysteries in the telesterion, when the pilgrims became initiated, taking place on that night. Certain restrictions were in force for this period, and part of the Eleusinian synthema (sacred phrase, in this context) recited by the initiates during the Eleusinian rite, according to the Christian author Clement of Alexandria, was as follows: 'I fasted, I drank the kykeon.'<sup>34</sup> While Clement's evidence about the Eleusinian Mysteries is not always reliable, the fasting and the kykeon could have been presupposed from a reading of the *Homeric Hymn*, according to which Demeter fasted as part of her anguish for the loss of her daughter Persephone. In particular, on arrival at Eleusis, Demeter sat and neither laughed nor tasted food or drink.<sup>35</sup> The pilgrims to Eleusis probably also fasted in imitation of the goddess; according to Ovid, the mystai ate when the stars appeared, but on which day (perhaps on the day of arrival at Eleusis, like Demeter) and whether an all-day fast is meant is not clear.<sup>36</sup> Fasting presumably also included abstention from wine, for Demeter declined the offer of wine made by Metaneira, the wife of Keleos, stating that it was not lawful for her to drink red wine, whereas when the kykeon was mixed for her, Demeter drank it because it was 'holy'.<sup>37</sup> There were apparently no rules for sexual restraint, except for the hierophant.<sup>38</sup>

The kykeon has been considered either a harmless concoction consisting of barley meal, penny-royal and water, or a powerful narcotic which gave drug-induced hallucinatory experiences to the

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

initiates, the narcotic value coming from the fermentation of the grain, or from opium in the kykeon.<sup>39</sup> But in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, the kykeon is simply a refreshment for the goddess and it was presumably significant for the mystai for that reason. Demeter drank the kykeon when she arrived at Eleusis, and the mystai probably also drank it soon after arriving.

As the mysteries were secret and silence was required of the initiate, the form of the initiation can never be known. Christian authors provide the most specific testimony about the Eleusinian Mysteries, but their polemical nature has long been noted.<sup>40</sup> In the *Homeric Hymn*, Demeter seeks Persephone with torches, and Christian sources are also explicit that this was represented as part of the ritual. Modern scholars generally accept that there was a sacred drama acted out at Eleusis, and it is possible that in imitation of Demeter the mystai had a nocturnal 'search' with torches.<sup>41</sup>

The reliefs on the Lovatelli urn and the Torre Nova sarcophagus, neither of Athenian origin, have been associated with aspects of the Eleusinian Mysteries.<sup>42</sup> The Lovatelli urn relates to the tale of Herakles' initiation, and shows a male figure clad in a lion skin. Herakles wished to be initiated into the mysteries but had murdered the Centaurs and was impure; the Lesser Mysteries were inaugurated in order to purify him, and most scholars identify the urn and sarcophagus with these mysteries.<sup>43</sup> Both reliefs depict a pig sacrifice and both also show a male figure seated on a stool which is covered with a fleece on the Torre Nova sarcophagus, but with the figure sitting on his own garment on the Lovatelli urn. Both have their heads covered over; the Lovatelli urn has a female figure holding a winnowing fan over the seated figure, on the Torre Nova sarcophagus, there is a female figure with a long lighted torch held upside down. These are clearly purification ceremonies. The seated figures could also represent the 'enthronement' which was perhaps a preliminary ceremony for the initiates in the telesterion.<sup>44</sup> A third element which both depict is a seated figure, brandishing a torch, presumably Demeter with the flame with which she scoured the earth in search of Persephone.<sup>45</sup> The pig sacrifice is a definite feature of the Greater Mysteries (but is a general feature of Demeter mysteries), while the veiled candidate on a fleece-covered stool is an aspect of the Demeter myth and could belong as readily to the Greater as to the Lesser Mysteries.

Pagan literary sources provide a few clues as to what happened

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

in the telesterion. Sight and hearing were both necessary.<sup>46</sup> When they arrived at Eleusis, the initiates were probably given instructions, as Proklos records: 'to those entering the temenos of Eleusis the program was stated, not to advance into the adyton'.<sup>47</sup> Aristotle states that initiates 'do not need to understand anything' but to 'experience',<sup>48</sup> presumably meaning the ritual was not complicated. Those who profaned the mysteries in 415 not only parodied the rites to the uninitiated but also spoke the secrets.<sup>49</sup> Perhaps what was said took the form of simple statements of explanation.

Plutarch provides some details about the atmosphere inside the telesterion: the initiates crowded together, making a good deal of noise, and jostling one another. Reverential awe and silence presumably followed when the rites were about to commence, and Maximus of Tyre wrote: 'As long as you have not reached the anaktoron, you are not initiated.' The telesterion was in darkness, and then the door of the anaktoron, the holy of holies, opened to reveal a great light, at which the initiates were silent and amazed.<sup>50</sup> Dio Chrysostom in writing of mysteries, without specifying Eleusis, states that the initiate saw mystical sights and mystical voices, and in the sanctum, 'darkness and light would appear to the initiate in alternation'. During the battle of Salamis (480) Plutarch writes that a great light was seen flashing from Eleusis, possibly the light in the telesterion during the mystery celebration.<sup>51</sup>

Clement of Alexandria records the synthema which he associated with initiation in the telesterion: 'I have fasted, I have drunk the kykeon, I have taken from the kiste, having done my task, deposited into the basket and out of the basket into the kiste.'<sup>52</sup> The fasting and the kykeon, because these are part of the myth, mean that the synthema provides no key to the secret of the mysteries. It is around the kistai that most speculation has developed, because they were an important element of the sacred procession, and the hierophant's role is clear: he was the revealer of the sacred cult items, which were almost certainly contained in the kistai.

According to Clement, the kistai contained sesame sweets, cakes in the shape of pyramids and balls, lumps of salt, a serpent, fennel, a woman's kteis (pudenda), and other items.<sup>53</sup> That the initiates took objects in and out of the kiste seems a complicated procedure for the thousands of initiates present. It would be unlikely that



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the sacred items would have been handled by the assembled body of initiates, and surely only the hierophant had this task.

While Clement may possibly have heard first-hand accounts from pagan apostates in Alexandria who had been initiated at Eleusis, his 'evidence' must still be taken as untrustworthy. The synthema and the contents of the kistai as recorded by him are clearly wrong, and he is apparently ignorant, as are the other Christian authors, of the true nature of the mysteries. Alexandria, the home of Clement, had its own mysteries and it is suggested that he appropriated a garbled version of the Alexandrian programme as the model for his denunciation of the Eleusinian rites.<sup>54</sup> It can also be noted that it is possible that Clement did know that the rites were not orgiastic in nature, for he describes Christ as the mystic hierophant who by his light guides the believer.<sup>55</sup> Diodoros states that the antiquity and purity, hagneia, of the mysteries have made them famous amongst mankind.<sup>56</sup>

Tertullian writes that the initiates were tortured; after five years they could become epoptai, and see the godhead – which he says is a phallus.<sup>57</sup> Asterios, another late Christian writer, claims that a sacred marriage took place between the hierophant and Demeter's priestess; the lights were extinguished and they copulated in the darkness, and salvation came for the mystai through this union.<sup>58</sup> The preoccupation of the Church Fathers with sexuality is clear in their accounts of the mysteries (and of paganism in general).

More plausibly, Theophrastos refers to agricultural implements, which ancient man 'consigned to secrecy and encountered as something sacred', perhaps in connection with the rites of Demeter, and it is plausible to suggest that the secret of the mysteries was associated with agriculture, and that the contents of the kistai were antique agricultural implements.<sup>59</sup> The hymn itself concerns agricultural fertility, and Triptolemos went forth from Eleusis to spread the art of agriculture amongst humankind.<sup>60</sup> Hippolytus, the Christian apologist, describes the revelation as 'the Athenians initiating people at the Eleusinia and showing to the epoptai that great and marvellous mystery of perfect revelation, in solemn silence, cut wheat'.<sup>61</sup> He perhaps, alone of the Christian authors, guessed at or knew the truth.

Why the initiates came is apparent: the mysteries guaranteed the blessings of a better afterlife. As the *Hymn to Demeter* promises, 'Blessed is he amongst mortal men who has seen the mysteries, but for those who are not initiated there is a wretched existence

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

in the gloom of Hades', or as Sophocles phrased it, 'Thrice blessed are those that have seen these rites and then come to Hades: there is life there for them alone; for the others, everything is evil.' If Plutarch is to be believed, Sophocles' lines caused myriads of uninitiated people to be despondent. Diogenes the Cynic, in response to Sophocles' statement, is said to have expressed astonishment that a robber would have a better afterlife than Epaminondas, the famous Theban, just because the former had been initiated. Pindar, who must have been an initiate, wrote, 'Blessed is he who after seeing these rites goes to Hades; he knows the end of life, he knows its Zeus-given beginnings.'<sup>62</sup>

Concern about the afterlife is a common human preoccupation, and the Homeric view of this was unattractive: Achilles, the famous warrior at Troy, would rather live as a servant of a poor man than be a shade in Hades, while Odysseus' glimpse into the underworld where shades cannot speak without drinking sacrificial blood is unappealing. Some heroes, such as Menelaos, received everlasting life in the pleasant Elysian fields, a utopia, and heroes went also to the Islands of the Blessed, but in the Homeric version of Hades the ordinary mortal had little to look forward to. Contrasted to this Homeric view are the happy lines in Aristophanes' *Frogs* which describe the life of the initiates in Hades: they are distanced from evil, they feast and dance happily. There was also a belief that for initiates life in this world would be improved in quality.<sup>63</sup>

This contrast between the different types of afterlife need not suggest that the mysteries grew up as a reaction against the Homeric view. The Eleusinian cult centre was ancient, and Eleusis in fact represents an alternative view probably as old if not older than the Homeric. If archaeological evidence at Eleusis attesting to Mycenaean activity at the site implies cult observances along the same lines as the classical (the anaktoron was built on the site of a Mycenaean building),<sup>64</sup> then the mysteries could have had a continuous history spanning almost two millennia.

The twenty-second of Boedromion was known as the Plemochoai, when the initiates made libations to the dead from vessels of this name. Perhaps this rite was connected with the Eleusinian promise for a better afterlife for the deceased. This day, when wine was available, was also spent in general festivities. The twenty-third of Boedromion was the last day of the Greater Mysteries, and on this day the initiates returned to Athens. Non-Athenians

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

may have chosen to depart directly from the bay of Eleusis. The boule was required to meet in the Eleusinion at Athens on the twenty-fourth of Boedromion, presumably in order to make a report about the mysteries, and possibly to investigate any misdemeanours or complaints arising out of the celebration.<sup>65</sup>

Eleusis had a sacred topography which was the object of veneration by pilgrims. The 'Mirthless Rock' is not mentioned in the *Homeric Hymn* but other sources have Demeter sitting there weeping on her arrival at Eleusis; it was near the Kallichoron Well, where dancing in honour of Demeter took place on the arrival of the initiates at Eleusis. In the *Homeric Hymn*, Demeter sat at the 'Maiden's Well' when she arrived at Eleusis and Kallichoron is possibly another name for this. The cave in the hillside within the sanctuary area contained a small edifice, and cult activity was clearly carried out here; the cave has been connected with Hades and referred to as a Plutonion, and may have represented an entrance to the underworld.<sup>66</sup>

In AD 364 Valentinian as emperor decreed that all nocturnal pagan rites be abolished, beginning 'at the hearth', a clear reference to the 'child of the hearth'.<sup>67</sup> The emperor relented under protests from Praetextatus, an initiate of Eleusis and proconsul of Greece, who argued that the abolition of the mysteries would be unbearable to the Greeks. According to Eunapios, the mysteries came to an end with the destruction of the Eleusinian sanctuary in AD 396 by Alaric the Goth. The last of the hierophants was himself something of an imposter, being a non-Athenian, and also a Mithraic priest and as such sworn not to preside over the ceremonies of other gods.<sup>68</sup> Nearly a millennium of pilgrimage activity had come to an end.

#### Samothrace

The mysteries of the 'Great Gods' on Samothrace began to be popular throughout the Greek world from the fourth century, when the first major buildings were constructed there. The rites were known outside of the island before this, and Herodotos was an initiate. These rites were secret, as were other mystery celebrations, and very few details are known about them.<sup>69</sup>

On the various inscriptions of Samothrace giving the names of mystai (initiates), 600 names can be read, and another 100 are partially preserved. These lists date from the second century BC to

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

perhaps the third century AD; the names of many Romans are recorded. Most of the *mystai* came from areas readily accessible to Samothrace, as would be expected: Thrace, Macedonia, and the Asia Minor coastline and Aegean islands, though Athens, Elis, Epidamnos on the west coast of Greece, and Alexandria (presumably the Egyptian city) are also represented. Spartans are not named in the *mystai* lists, but Plutarch mentions participation by the Spartan king Antalkidas, and Lysander.<sup>70</sup>

It has been stated that a non-Greek language was used in the cult in the classical and hellenistic periods, but this was almost certainly not the case and there may simply have been some archaic or perhaps arcane words in the rites. As at Eleusis, all initiates had to be able to understand Greek.<sup>71</sup> The Samothracian deities worshipped in the mysteries were called simply either 'Theoi' (Gods) or 'Theoi Megaloi' (Great Gods). Even in antiquity they were erroneously connected with the Kabeiroi, non-Greek deities associated with fertility, worshipped by the Greeks.<sup>72</sup> Three main gods are named by one ancient author: Axieros, Axiokersa, and Axiokersos, with a fourth, Kasmilos, as an addition to these gods.<sup>73</sup> The identities of these deities, based on various not necessarily correct identifications in the ancient sources, are debated. They may be Demeter, Persephone and Hades, or the Dioskouroi (Castor and Pollux) and a Cybele-like goddess.<sup>74</sup>

Varro writes of two ithyphallic statues in the *anaktoron* at Samothrace, and Herodotos indicates that the ithyphallic statues were explained in the mysteries. The Samothracian mysteries might therefore have been fertility rites.<sup>75</sup> Ithyphallicism, however, has a strong connection with apotropaism, the warding away of danger, which might fit in with the cult's promise to save men 'in dangers on the sea', a promise which might have become extended to cover life in general. This would help to explain the presence of women as initiates; however, apotropaism is not mentioned in the sources, though Herodotos makes these statues the inspiration for the ithyphallic *hermai* at Athens, which were clearly apotropaic in nature.

One feature of the mysteries is clear. The initiates put on a purple *tainia* (sash or belt), which was 'to preserve the initiates in dangers on the sea'.<sup>76</sup> Iron rings have been found in the sanctuary, and Samothracian iron was considered to be 'lodestone', magnetised iron, which was thought to have magical properties. It has been suggested that rings such as those found in the sanctuary may have been given to the initiates.<sup>77</sup>

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

As at Eleusis, only the *mystai* could enter the sacred places.<sup>78</sup> There were other similarities with Eleusis. There was an initial proclamation forbidding the polluted from taking part,<sup>79</sup> and another ceremony involved the priest asking the initiate what was the worst thing he had ever done, though that this was a confession is usually rejected. The priest was probably seeking to ascertain that the would-be initiate was pure.<sup>80</sup>

The initiation ceremony took place at night.<sup>81</sup> Unlike Eleusis it was possible for the two stages of initiation attested at Samothrace, the *myesis* and *epopteia*, to take place in a single night: a worshipper arrived uninitiated, became a *mystes*, and could then become an *epoptes*.<sup>82</sup>

At Samothrace two buildings, the *anaktoron* and the *hieron*, had seating arrangements and altars, and it is suggested that initiation took place in both of these two buildings. One of the inscriptions forbidding those who had not been initiated from entering was found at the entrance of the *hieron*, indicating that only those who had already been initiated could enter this building. A similar inscription was discovered at an inside door of the *anaktoron*, suggesting that the uninitiated could enter the *anaktoron* but not its northern chamber. Cole accordingly suggests that the first stage, *myesis*, took place in the *anaktoron*, and the *epopteia* in the *hieron*.<sup>83</sup>

Dedications were made to the 'Great Gods' by those who were saved from shipwreck. But Diagoras of Melos was blunt on the subject of votives when at Samothrace a friend pointed out the votive paintings dedicated by those who had survived storms at sea, taking these as evidence of divine involvement in human affairs. Diagoras retorted that those who died at sea did not have the opportunity to dedicate pictures.<sup>84</sup> The Samothracian Mysteries were similar to the Eleusinian in various respects; some form of salvation was promised by both, and it was this promise which drew pilgrims from northern Greece and Asia Minor to Samothrace.

#### Andania and Lykosoura

A long cult regulation dating to 92/1 BC provides much information about the annual Andanian Mysteries in Messenia and on what was expected of worshippers at a pilgrimage site. Pausanias writes that he considers the Andanian Mysteries as second only

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

to the Eleusinian Mysteries in sanctity. The mysteries were not celebrated during the period of Spartan domination of Messenia from the seventh century on: the priests of the Great Goddesses fled to Athens, returning to Messenia only with its liberation by the Thebans in 369. When Epaminondas founded Messene as a capital for the liberated Messenia, it was said that a bronze urn was discovered, within which was thin tinfoil rolled up like a book, on which the mysteries of the Great Goddesses were inscribed, which priests then copied into books. Similarly when in 92/1 Mnasistratos seems to have reorganised or reinstituted the mysteries, he donated a chest and books to the cult. The inscription does not reveal anything about the nature of the cult of the mysteries themselves, for as with the Eleusinian Mysteries silence was required of the initiates. There were *kistai* (chests) containing sacred, mystic items placed on carts which were drawn by sacred virgins. While Pausanias writes of the Great Goddesses (Demeter and Kore), and mentions Apollo Karneios and Hermes, the Andanian inscription itself speaks of Demeter, Hermes, the Great Gods (*Theoi Megaloi*), Apollo Karneios and Hagna (a title of Kore, daughter of Demeter).<sup>85</sup>

The mysteries of the 'Mistress' (*Despoina*) at Lykosoura in an isolated mountain valley some 14 kilometres from Megalopolis in Arcadia, were also of importance to the Arcadians, and Pausanias writes that this goddess was worshipped more than any other by the Arcadians. He writes that he 'fears' to reveal her real name to the uninitiated, indicating that he has become initiated in her cult. *Despoina* was the daughter of Poseidon and Demeter, and Demeter was associated with her in the cult. Cult regulations, dating from the third or the beginning of the second century BC, survive which like the Andanian mysteries reveal much about organisational details and eligibility for initiation, but not about the mysteries themselves. Its most peculiar feature was that the sacrificial animals did not have their throats cut but each man hewed off whatever limb came to hand.<sup>86</sup>

#### HEALING SANCTUARIES

Of all the reasons for which pilgrims undertook pilgrimage, one of the most popular was the pilgrimage in search of a cure. In cases of illness it is only natural for the individual to call upon the gods for assistance. In the classical and hellenistic periods,

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

many cities and towns had sanctuaries dedicated to the god of healing, Asklepios, but there were some sanctuaries which enjoyed a greater prominence than others, such as Epidauros, Pergamon and Kos which gained panhellenic status. In addition, the healing sanctuary of Amphiaraos at Oropos was a popular pilgrimage destination.

#### Epidauros

The geographical locations of Asklepios' healing sanctuaries, the Asklepieia, are significant in their coverage of the Greek world:<sup>87</sup> the three panhellenic shrines were Epidauros, serving the mainland, Kos in the Aegean (though no doubt receiving some 'patients' from the mainland as well),<sup>88</sup> and Pergamon in Asia Minor.<sup>89</sup> Philostratos, writing in the late second century AD, states that just as Asia flocked to Pergamon to be cured by Asklepios, so all of Crete and even many Libyans (presumably from Cyrene and its satellite towns) from across the sea visited the shrine of Asklepios at Lebena in southern Crete.<sup>90</sup> Epidauros became important as a healing centre from the fifth century onwards, supplanting to a large extent the earlier sanctuary at Trikka in Thessaly, and asserted its superiority over the nearby Asklepieion at Troizen.<sup>91</sup> The Amphiaraion of the healing hero Amphiaraos at Oropos had a clientele drawn from throughout Boeotia and Attica.<sup>92</sup> The temples of healing at these sites attracted the sick and dying from throughout the Greek world. In addition, both Epidauros and Kos had penteteric festivals involving contests.

Asklepios was considered as the special provider of cures for mankind, though his father Apollo also had the ability to cure illness.<sup>93</sup> The great fourth-century inscribed list of cures (*iamata*) at Epidauros has as its heading 'The Cures of Apollo and Asklepios',<sup>94</sup> though the actual cures themselves never mention Apollo as a curing agent, but only Asklepios.<sup>95</sup> The inscriptions were erected by the Epidaurian temple authorities to make the cures and hence the powers of the god generally known, as well as to dispel scepticism and anxiety amongst pilgrims.<sup>96</sup> Some of the *iamata* were clearly copied from personal records left by grateful pilgrims, who inscribed their individual cure on a pinax (tablet; plural: pinakes), which they dedicated in the temple. Strabo writes that pinakes were dedicated at Epidauros, Kos and Trikka, and that Asklepios' temple at Epidauros was always full of the sick. The

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

archaeological remains from the classical period attest that this must have been the case several centuries before he wrote. At Oropos, the names of the incubants and their cities were to be inscribed once they had paid the fee for incubating (sleeping overnight in the sanctuary for the purpose of having a dream by which means they hope to be cured).<sup>97</sup>

At Epidauros, the god cured pilgrims of a wide range of ailments, including lengthy pregnancies, infertility, paralysed limbs, blindness, gall stones, baldness, dropsy, worms, lice, headache, pus, and sterility, while at Lebena, Asklepios treated sciatica, infertility and abdominal problems. That different healing sanctuaries specialised in different types of cure seems unlikely. This was once thought to have been the case at Corinth, but the discovery of large numbers of terracotta body parts of every description means that this view can no longer be held.<sup>98</sup> Moreover, the iamata of Epidauros cover an amazing number of complaints, and there the god cured every illness.

Asklepios had not always been considered a god, and originally his birthplace was said to be in Thessaly, but Epidauros, with the support of the Delphic oracle, claimed to be his birthplace, as do the *Hymns of Isyllos*, engraved at Epidauros, which have the version that Koronis gave birth to the child of Apollo in the temple itself.<sup>99</sup>

Those seeking cures at Epidauros came from a variety of places, and the inscriptions there attest to pilgrims from all over the Greek world, clearly indicating the popularity of the cult. Patients, as recorded in the iamata, came from Aegina, Argos, Athens, Chios, Epeiros, Halieis, Herakleia, Hermione, Kaphyiai, Keos, Kirrha, Knidos, Lampsakos, Messene, Mytilene, Pellana, Pherai, Sparta, Thasos, Thebes, Thessaly, Torone and Troizen;<sup>100</sup> the main areas not represented are the Greek cities of Sicily, Italy and the Black Sea, presumably too far from Epidauros for the sick to travel there.

Those who were sick could visit an Asklepieion in their local area if there was one, and the spread of Asklepieia throughout the world occurred because, as one source says, it was more convenient to visit a local shrine than to have to travel to Trikkha or Epidauros; in fact Aristagora of Troizen, not far from Epidauros, chose to incubate in her local Asklepieion, which obviously had a flourishing practice despite its proximity to Epidauros.<sup>101</sup> This, however, did not detract from the popularity of panhellenic sites



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

such as Epidauros, Pergamon and Kos. Obviously, if pilgrims could afford it, or felt the need strongly enough, they would travel to one of the more important sites. Both Epidauros and Kos embarked on ambitious building programmes at their sanctuaries in the fourth century, at the very time that Asklepieia had spread throughout the Greek world; clearly the healing power of the god was felt to be more efficacious at a major sanctuary.<sup>102</sup>

Of interest is the fact that Asklepieia were spreading throughout the Greek world at the same time that medicine was developing.<sup>103</sup> Nevertheless, the doctors and the god do not seem to have been in competition, and the development of Hippocratic medicine did not mean the end of temple healing in the Greek world.<sup>104</sup> The god was allowed his clients without any condemnation by doctors; on the contrary Asklepios was the patron of doctors at all times. On the island of Kos, which was the medical centre *par excellence* of the Greek world, the medical practitioners existed side by side with a major healing centre which relied on faith healing.<sup>105</sup>

When pilgrims came to Epidauros, they spent the night in the abaton, a building set aside for this purpose, where they hoped to have a dream of Asklepios which would cure them.<sup>106</sup> The ritual relating to the abaton at Athens is clarified by the account of Aristophanes, as the Epidaurian iamata record personal epiphanies (appearances of the god), but not the procedure involved. In the *Wealth*, after the offerings had been made, the incubants lay on the floor. Aristophanes describes as incubating in the abaton both Ploutos, the blind god of wealth, and many others suffering from every kind of illness. When the servant of the god had doused the lights and commanded the suppliants to fall asleep, and to behave, the god appeared while the suppliants slept, and effected his cures. The temple servants seem to have been in charge of the incubants.<sup>107</sup>

Iconography confirms the suppliant's experience. A relief found at the Amphiaraion at Oropos is important for an understanding of what the incubants thought happened to them during the night. In the background, the suppliant sleeps on a bed, watched over by the healing deity Amphiaraos, while in the foreground, the same person stands, supporting his right hand with his left, while Amphiaraos touches his right shoulder.<sup>108</sup> This is clearly how the pilgrims visualised their experience.

In the iamata of the Asklepieion at Lebena on Crete dreams are not often mentioned, but the iamata there record that the ill were

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

cured while they slept. Demandros of Gortyn was operated on by Asklepios while asleep, and while a woman was asleep there the god placed a *sikya*, cupping instrument, on her; she left and became pregnant. These appear to be references to dreams, and three other *iamata* record instructions given by the god to suppliants who were subsequently cured, one of which mentions visions seen by the patient while asleep.<sup>109</sup> All of this evidence strongly suggests that all the Asklepieia, as well as the Amphiaraion at Oropos,<sup>110</sup> relied upon dreams as the customary curative medium.

It also seems that the inspiration for some of the pilgrimages was a vision of the god while the sufferer was still in his or her home-town. According to the testimonies of the Epidaurian *iamata*, the ill did not always solicit the god, but rather he commanded them to present themselves at a particular Asklepieion. When Eratokles was about to undergo cautery at the hands of doctors, he had a dream in which Asklepios appeared to him and persuaded him not to allow the cauterisation to take place, but to go to Epidauros, where he was subsequently cured.<sup>111</sup> In this case, it might seem that the anxiety of the patient, about to undergo cautery for a cure, suggested the idea of a painless cure by Asklepios, and led to subliminal suggestion. In the case of Demandros and the woman mentioned above, both were ordered by Asklepios in a dream to go to the sanctuary.

It is easy for the modern reader to be sceptical about the cures attributed to Asklepios, but this scepticism is not new, according to the testimony of the *iamata*. Ambrosia of Athens who was blind in one eye scoffed at the cures which were recorded at Epidauros, and at the belief that the lame and blind could become better just through having a dream. But she incubated, and in her dream the god appeared to her and said that he would make her well, but as payment she would have to place in the shrine a silver pig as a remembrance of her ignorance.<sup>112</sup> Such an inscription no doubt served to convince the sceptics, and encouraged others to have faith in the god.

But obtaining a dream could in itself become a matter for anxiety, for the god might fail to appear. Apollonios, arriving at Pergamon, gave advice to the suppliants on what to do in order to obtain 'favourable dreams'. The Epidaurian *iamata* record that the incubant did not always dream. One of the sick, Sostrata of Pherai, after an obscure dream departed from Epidauros disappointed (but with no ill-feeling towards the god), only to receive

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

a personal epiphany on the way home in which she was cured. Thersandros of Halieis saw no dream while sleeping in the abaton, but was cured on his return home by one of the sacred serpents which had travelled on the wagon, coiled up on the axle for the journey.<sup>113</sup> Most of the iamata, however, record that the incubant did have a dream while sleeping in the abaton.<sup>114</sup> Even incubation was not always essential and some pilgrims were cured upon arrival at the sanctuary. Incubation by proxy was also possible, though in this particular case, the god sent the same dream both to the proxy in the abaton, and to the sick individual who had stayed at home.<sup>115</sup>

Asklepios did not always heal alone but had a number of assistants. A 'beautiful boy' appears in one Epidaurian iama, where he cures a man with a stone in his genitals by inducing a wet-dream. Other iamata record that a good-looking youth applied a drug to the malignant toe of an incubant, and that a woman who had come in the hope of falling pregnant slept in the abaton and dreamt that a beautiful youth uncovered her and that the god then touched her with his hand. This youth, or youths, can be included in the list of the helpers of Asklepios, joining a goose, dogs, serpents, and on the inanimate level, dice, as Asklepios' associates.<sup>116</sup>

Most important of these associates were the sacred serpents<sup>117</sup> and dogs of Asklepios, which pilgrims encountered while at Epidauros, as well as seeing them represented in Epidaurian art. Pausanias records that the chryselephantine statue of Asklepios at Epidauros was half the size of the statue of Olympian Zeus at Athens and describes its features which incorporated important elements of the cult of healing at Epidauros: Asklepios is seated, holding a staff around which a serpent is entwined, one hand above the head of the serpent, while a dog lies beside the statue. The staff with serpent was the typical cult motif and most representations of Asklepios show him with staff in hand, with a serpent entwined around the staff beneath his hand.<sup>118</sup> The dog also appeared on Epidaurian coins. Serpents played an important role as cult proselytisers, transferring Asklepios' cult from Epidauros to Halieis and Sikyon. The establishment of the cult of Asklepios at Athens in 420, possibly because of the plague, included fetching a serpent from Epidauros in a chariot.<sup>119</sup>

The cures for which serpents were responsible at Epidauros fall into three categories: they caused pregnancies, healed sores by licking, or brought about cures by unspecified means.<sup>120</sup> The ser-

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

pent's association with Asklepios was explained by the ancients as being due to the fact that the serpent sheds its skin for a new one annually, and was considered to be a symbol of renewal and healing. Modern scholars, impressed by the serpent's role in pregnancy, prefer to see the serpent's role as phallic.<sup>121</sup> Serpents also seem to have been part of the cult of Amphiaraos at Oropos.<sup>122</sup> The tholos (or thymele), a round building at Epidauros, of which only the foundations remain, has a substructure which consists of a labyrinthine series of concentric circles arranged as a maze. Scholars have suggested that it had a therapeutic significance, but it was probably the 'home' of the sacred snakes, and it is not mentioned in the iamata.<sup>123</sup>

In the cases described by the surviving iamata at Epidauros all the pilgrims were cured. However, if the supplication of the god was unsuccessful, and the 'patient' was beyond help, she or he would be removed from the site, for there was a ritual law that no one was allowed to die (or a woman give birth) within the sanctuary which was marked off by an enclosure; this was typical Greek practice.<sup>124</sup> That there was this provision, even at Epidauros, showed that not everyone was cured there, and for them the journey had been in vain.

Some of the Epidaurian iamata record cures of a fantastic nature. Kleo, who had been pregnant for five years, came to Epidauros and slept in the abaton. When she left the sacred area she gave birth to a son, who immediately washed himself in a fountain and walked about.<sup>125</sup> Such iamata do not give the lie to Asklepios' cures, but rather are a record of the beliefs held about Asklepios, and describe the experiences which pilgrims expected to undergo at Epidauros. The iamata are aretalogiai, stories celebrating the arete (virtue) of the god: they are didactic in nature and attest to his power, aim to sway sceptics, and assure pilgrims that there is hope for them too.<sup>126</sup>

Healing shrines were probably open on a full yearly basis, and there is no evidence to suggest that the healing sanctuaries opened their doors to the sick only at specific periods or seasons. Sickness is, of course, perennial: for this reason, healing sanctuaries never invited the sick through special embassies once a year, though there are indications that seasonal factors might affect the attendance rates at healing shrines. An inscription from Oropos instructs the priest of Amphiaraos to be present at the shrine from the end of winter until the summer ploughing.<sup>127</sup> This is an indication that

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the shrine was more frequented in this period, perhaps because travel was easier, and the inscription required not simply the presence of the guardian of the shrine, the neokoros, but also that of the priest.

The means by which cures were effected are clear: abstinence, ritual bathing, payment of a fee, sacrifice, incubation, dreams, and then healing, followed by thanksgiving by a dedication.<sup>128</sup> Individuals were cured in the Asklepieia, but the view that the priests were actually doctors is unnecessary. At Oropos, incubation could take place without the presence of the priest, and in none of the Asklepieia is there evidence for medical treatment, even on Kos. The ill who revived in the Asklepieia, or soon after, recovered either in the natural course of events, or through their faith in the god.

From the iamata, it is clear that Asklepios emerges above all as *the* healing god. While Asklepios could be vindictive or angry, he was generally compassionate and was never bad tempered for long: in fact, he had a sense of humour, and was caring and administered to the needs of his worshippers. He was the ideal general medical practitioner, and to achieve healing at his hands there were strict rituals which were to be followed. His cult lasted for hundreds of years and was one of the last to succumb to the progress of Christianity; in fact in many places his cult was adapted rather than deposed.<sup>129</sup>

Epidauros and other major healing sanctuaries were important pilgrimage destinations. It can perhaps be presumed that these tended to attract people from the higher socio-economic groups as they travelled a long way, and many would, presumably, have stayed several nights at Epidauros. Sostrata who was borne on a litter to Epidauros had companions,<sup>130</sup> and presumably many pilgrims brought slaves with them as assistants. Significantly, women were prominent amongst those seeking the aid of the god. For nearly a millennium, the sick and the dying made their way to Epidauros: not all were cured, but this did not affect the flow of travellers to the site.

#### ORACULAR CENTRES

There were numerous oracles in the Greek world. Croesus sent envoys to several oracular centres in order to test their veracity: Delphi, Abai in Phokis, Dodona, Didyma, the oracles of Amphia-

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

raos (Thebes) and Trophonios (Lebadeia), and Siwah; only the Pythia could correctly tell him what he was doing on the hundredth day after his messengers set out to the oracles and asked this question. This was clearly a Delphic story to support Delphi's place as the foremost panhellenic oracle;<sup>131</sup> however, Dodona and Didyma were also important oracular centres. Oracles largely served to give advice on ritual matters and to provide divine consent for preferred courses of action.

#### The Delphic oracle

Delphi in the early eighth century was a local oracle, and its position as a sanctuary not under the sway of any powerful city presumably helped it to gain panhellenic status from the late eighth century onwards.<sup>132</sup> Strabo wrote that the oracle at Delphi was considered to be the most truthful of all.<sup>133</sup> Delphi was the most important of the oracular centres, and the place *par excellence* to which pilgrims came from all over the Greek world (and outside of it) in order to bring their inquiries before the god Apollo. Here the Pythia gave her prophecies to the consultants. They came with questions concerning the political affairs of their states, matters of magnitude such as war and peace, and alliances and enmities. At the same time Delphi was also the place to which Greeks in general brought their problems: those of childlessness, bad harvests, famines, plagues, and questions of marriage. In addition to the oracle, the Pythian festival with equestrian, athletic and musical contests was celebrated here every four years.

Delphi was obviously an impressive site in antiquity. A visit to Delphi was rather like a modern tourist visit to the site. In Euripides' *Ion*, the slaves of Kreousa look around and wonder at the marvellous buildings, and they inquire of Ion, the temple attendant, whether it is permitted for them to go into the temple of Apollo. They are told that if they have provided the *pelanos*, literally a sacred cake, they can go as far as the altar, but that if they wish to go inside the temple itself, they need to sacrifice a beast.<sup>134</sup> Ion tells them that they are welcome to look at everything which is open to the public. Several centuries later, Philinos escorted a foreign visitor around Delphi until well into the evening, though he admits that the pace of the tour was unhurried. He pointed out statues and votive offerings, the Korykion cave and the Lykoreia, all of which formed part of the sights which this

visitor was keen to see. In Plutarch's day there were guides with a fixed itinerary, which included inscriptions, statues, treasures and other miscellaneous items of interest, though on some points the knowledge of the guides was somewhat limited.<sup>135</sup>

### The Pythia

Diodoros writes that in the remote past goats discovered the oracle, and that is why the Delphians preferred to sacrifice goats when consulting it. Any goat that came to the Delphic chasm and looked into it jumped about in an amazing fashion. A goatherd observed this; he looked into the chasm and reacted like the goats, but having the faculty of human speech was able to prophesy. The power of the chasm became known, and it became a public health hazard as many who peered into it and came under its influence threw themselves in. Consequently the locals decided to entrust the responsibility of prophesying to one woman, and to ensure that she did not also disappear into the chasm provided her with a tripod on which she might sit over it in safety. Diodoros' account is aetiological in nature, a myth explaining goats, the tripod and the priestess.<sup>136</sup>

Fifth- and fourth-century authors do not mention the chasm or vapour.<sup>137</sup> There is no archaeological evidence for a chasm under the temple of Apollo at Delphi, and that a *pneuma* (vapour or breeze) inspired the priestess must be dismissed.<sup>138</sup> Nevertheless Plutarch often refers to *pneumata*, *dynamis*, *anathymiasis* and *atmoi* as being the inducers of the Pythia's mantic possession, but these are clearly theoretical concepts.<sup>139</sup>

But Diodoros and his story of the chasm with its prophecy-inducing vapours is at least partly responsible for the distorted view of the Pythia. To the Roman author Lucan, who had never visited Delphi, is owed the picture of the frenzied Pythia which still has wide acceptance. In his *Civil War*, Lucan has Apollo possess the Pythia: she is described as raging and rushing around madly, her head shaking in a great fury. The portrait increases in colour, with an account of madness, foaming lips, groans and cries. Lucan, however, wrote from ignorance: he had not been to Delphi and he had no knowledge of Delphic procedure, and his description derives from Virgil's account of Aeneas' visit to the Sibyl at Cumae. It can be noted in contrast that Philostratos in the early third century BC stresses the simplicity of the oracular procedure at

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

Delphi, presumably implying that there was nothing extraordinary about the behaviour of the Pythia.<sup>140</sup> Herodotos and other classical authors make no comment about any maddened behaviour. In Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, the Pythia is described as running screaming from the adyton, the interior of the temple. She had calmly entered the adyton, where she encountered Orestes, a suppliant surrounded by the Erinyes (Furies), and naturally fled in alarm, but the incident is not evidence for prophetic madness. It demonstrates a normal reaction to a fearful and unexpected sight.<sup>141</sup>

In Plutarch's day, an incident occurred which has been taken as meaning that the Pythia was frenzied. In describing a consultation that went wrong, he comments that the Pythia's voice was harsh, and she gave an inarticulate and fearful shriek. But this was just before she fled the temple. The sacrificial beast necessary for a consultation had refused to shake its head and signify its willingness to submit voluntarily, so the priests had drenched it with water before it would shake its head. The need to do this was a bad omen and the Pythia only took her seat unwillingly, and her responses were forced; then becoming hysterical she ran towards the exit with a scream and died a few days later.<sup>142</sup> It would be incorrect to take this incident as any indication of the normal prophetic practice; it is, in fact, the reverse.

The oracle could be consulted on one day a month, except during winter. Some states had *promanteia*, the right to consult the oracle before other states did so, implying a large clientele. In the classical period, there were two Pythias, with a third kept 'in reserve'. This attests to the popularity of the oracle in the classical period. But in Plutarch's day, the one priestess met every need, as in the early days of the oracle. The pilgrim was greeted by an older woman, dressed as a virgin, symbolising her chastity while in the service of Apollo. She could be married, but while in service as a Pythia had her own dwelling, and practised chastity.<sup>143</sup>

Herodotos takes it for granted that his listeners and readers will know the procedure of the oracle. Similarly, in discussing the Thracian oracle of Dionysos among the Bessoi, a branch of the Satrai tribe, it is sufficient for him to state that the priestess of the oracle gave her oracles just as was done at Delphi.<sup>144</sup> It seems that the Pythia bathed in the Kastalian spring, and drank from it as well.<sup>145</sup> Plutarch states that there was a stream of water below the temple; the water was used for libations and lustrations, but he does not mention that the water inspired prophecy. On the



other hand, Pausanias records the popular belief that the waters of the Kassotis spring at Delphi went under the earth, and induced the Pythia to prophesy; other sources also record that the priestess drank water prior to prophesying.<sup>146</sup>

From the fifth century on there seems to have been a belief that chewing laurel could effect a state of readiness for inspiration from the god, but only non-classical sources attribute the inspired state of the Pythia to the laurel.<sup>147</sup> Biologically, the chemical constituents of the laurel do not induce ecstasy. Items such as laurel and pine wood, barley grains and incense were burned during the mantic session and could have comprised the vapours referred to by some sources.<sup>148</sup>

Heliodoros in the third century AD wrote that an inquirer purified himself at the Kastalian spring before proceeding to the temple to consult the Pythia, but Ion mentions only the pelanos and sacrifice as preliminary rituals.<sup>149</sup> However, the Pythia could refuse an oracle to murderers who were still polluted, implying that the consultant had to be ritually pure.<sup>150</sup> The consultant entered the temple after having made the sacrifice of the pelanos, a cake; by the late fifth century BC there was a monetary charge for this. Within the temple a goat would be sacrificed, and as in other rituals it was sprinkled with water so that it would nod its head and signify its willingness to be sacrificed. Normally the priestess would not be present at this point.<sup>151</sup> The priestess, then led into the temple, would seat herself on her tripod in view of the consultants, as the artistic representations make clear, and listen to the inquiries put to her.<sup>152</sup> The east pediment of the Siphnian treasury at Delphi, dated to the sixth century, depicts the struggle between Herakles and Apollo for the tripod, indicating that the tripod clearly had an early association with the Apolline oracle. Several ancient sources mention the prophetes, but the duties of this official, other than as an attendant to the Pythia during the mantic session, are not clear.<sup>153</sup> The artistic evidence depicts the worshipper standing before the Pythia, or the god of prophecy himself, and the inquirers put the questions directly to the priestess.<sup>154</sup>

Lloyd-Jones wrote that the reply of the Pythia to the question posed was 'shouted, and no doubt incoherent; the prophetes had to make sense of it, and render it in hexameter verse'.<sup>155</sup> However, Plutarch, who was a priest of the oracle, in *The Oracles at Delphi No Longer Given in Verse* gives a discussion about the fact that the incumbents of the office of the Pythia in his time did not give

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

their oracles in verse, and in fact states that even many ancient oracles were given in prose, with oracles in hexameter verse the exception. Many of the ancient Pythias produced hexameters, but with their oracles full of metrical and verbal errors and uninspired diction. The quality of the oracles depended on the incumbent of the office. Plutarch's character Sarapion argues that it is not right to expect the Pythia to speak in 'purer tones' than she does. The voice of the inspired Pythia did not belong to the god, 'nor did the utterance, nor the style, nor the metre; rather all these things emanated from the woman with Apollo providing the visions and knowledge of the future'.<sup>156</sup> There was a story in Plutarch's time that in the past, poets, not associated with the temple, would listen to the words of the Pythia and recast them into verse, presumably for individual inquirers.<sup>157</sup>

The view that priests needed to recast the words of the Pythia stems partly from the belief that she was always a peasant woman. It has even been stated that the ancient pagans gloried in the fact that the Pythia was an uneducated woman.<sup>158</sup> If anything, the tone of Plutarch, in noting that the present Pythia is a peasant woman, is in fact almost apologetic. He states that she might be of poor background, but has been well brought up. Euripides states that the Pythia 'was selected from all the women of Delphi', and Plutarch that in his day the particular Pythia on the tripod at the time was a woman of humble means, as if this were not always the case.<sup>159</sup> The main criterion for selection of a priestess must have been susceptibility to 'inspiration', but how this was determined is unknown.

The occasions when a particular priestess was accused of having been bribed must almost certainly indicate that it was she who was responsible for the actual responses. Cases of alleged bribery involved Kleomenes and the Alkmeonidai, both in the sixth century, and Pleistoanax in the following century. Kleomenes won the support of an individual named Kobon, influential at Delphi, who persuaded the Pythian priestess, Periallos, when questioned by the Spartans as to whether Demaratos was a legitimate king, to reply that Demaratos was not the son of Ariston, the previous king. In subsequent years, the whole affair came to light, and Kobon fled and Periallos was deprived of her office. The Alkmeonidai in exile under the Peisistratid tyranny intrigued with the Pythia that she instruct any Spartans coming to consult the oracle that they must free Athens from the tyrants. Pleistoanax had been

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

restored as king of Sparta on the advice of a Delphic oracle ('bring home the seed of the demigod son of Zeus'), but his enemies accused him of having bribed the Pythia.<sup>160</sup> Lysander, however, later failed in his attempt to bribe the priestess.<sup>161</sup> In one apocryphal story, a priestess who had accepted a bribe was bitten by a snake as she entered the adyton and died.<sup>162</sup>

Lexicographers mention that sacred lots were employed at Delphi in addition to verbal prophecy.<sup>163</sup> It is possible that lots, in a bowl held by the priestess, somehow leapt in response to the question asked of the Pythia.<sup>164</sup> The fourth-century agreement between Delphi and Skiathos seems to mention two procedures: the verbal method and the 'two beans'. But it has also been argued that this is a reference to sacrificial cakes, which seems the better interpretation as otherwise there is only late evidence for the use of the lot at Delphi.<sup>165</sup>

Two non-verbal oracular responses are, however, mentioned. The Thessalians requested that the priestess choose a king of Thessaly by drawing one from many beans carved with the names of various candidates; this story may or may not be historical.<sup>166</sup> Similarly, the Athenians in 352/1, seeking a decision from Delphi about whether or not to cultivate a plot of sacred land at Eleusis, had two pieces of tin inscribed and then wrapped in wool so that they could not be distinguished from each other, and placed one in a silver and one in a gold jar. An embassy was chosen to go to Delphi to ask which piece of tin, in which jar – the gold or the silver – should determine what action the Athenians were to take. This provides a variation on the normal prophetic answer in that the oracle could not answer 'yes' or 'no' about the land but had to choose a particular jar.<sup>167</sup>

#### 'Concerning crops or children'

In the *Ion*, Ion carefully elicits information from Kreousa about why her husband, Xouthos, has come to Delphi and the purpose of his visit, and when in the *Andromache* Neoptolemos visited Delphi he was asked about his reasons for coming.<sup>168</sup> It seems very likely that the temple personnel and the Pythia would be informed in advance of any probable request and of the reaction for which the consultant was hoping. Each consultant had to have a proxenos, to whom a great deal about the purpose of the pilgrimage would surely have been revealed. Among African oracles, and in

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

divination generally, the practice of eliciting information and the answer which the inquirer desires has been demonstrated; moreover, questions posed often contained the response which was required because the consultants were frequently seeking divine approval for a course of action upon which they wished to embark.<sup>169</sup>

The questions asked of the Pythia covered a wide range of topics, and the personal character of many of the questions asked at the oracle of Zeus at Dodona can be noted in this context. At Delphi, while there were clearly many inquiries about official matters, there were also a significant number of personal inquiries. Asklepios, and Zeus at Dodona, were not the only gods who could be asked about having children. Ion asks Kreousa whether she has come to Delphi concerning 'crops or children'.<sup>170</sup> The political questions posed to the Delphic oracle were bound up with the affairs of the city-state, and the oracle played an important role in assisting city-states to deal with political and social problems which confronted them. The oracle declined when the city-states lost their political independence, beginning with Macedonian interference, and ending when Greece came under Roman domination, so much so that Plutarch could write a treatise on the decline of oracles. In fact, by Plutarch's time, momentous questions of state policy seem to have been rather rare, due to the peaceful and settled conditions applying in Greece, and the questions now posed were frequently on 'trivial and everyday matters', whether one should marry, sail, or lend money, while questions asked by states were about crops, the fertility of herds, and public health.<sup>171</sup> Indeed, the practical nature of these questions is advanced as an explanation as to why the Pythia of that time prophesied in plain prose rather than elaborate verse.<sup>172</sup> The last oracle of Delphi was said to have been delivered in the time of Julian the Apostate, who attempted to restore paganism as the official religion of the Roman Empire in AD 361–363,<sup>173</sup> but with Greece under Roman rule, the pressing political concerns of the Greek cities of classical and (to a lesser extent) hellenistic times had passed away, and the pax Romana had caused a decline several centuries before this.

Delphi's best known role is perhaps in the field of Greek colonisation, which took place primarily from the eighth to the sixth century.<sup>174</sup> However, many colonies of the eighth and seventh centuries had not consulted the Delphic oracle before setting out, and it is probable that some colonies, particularly in the sixth and

fifth centuries when Delphi had become truly panhellenic, invented oracles to give them Apollo's backing.<sup>175</sup> Historical examples indicate the nature of Apollo's role. When Dorieus set out to found a colony in Libya, Herodotos states that he failed because he had not consulted the oracle. Herodotos makes clear his belief that divine backing was necessary for any colonial venture. Dorieus then decided to found a colony in Sicily, this time consulting Delphi – not as to where the colony should be founded, but whether he 'would obtain the land for which he was setting out; the Pythia responded that he would obtain it'. Similarly, the Spartans decided to found a colony in 426, Herakleia in Trachis, and then they 'consulted the god at Delphi, and at his bidding they sent out the colonists'.<sup>176</sup> These examples make clear that normally Delphi's role was to give the god's consent to a colonial venture and destination already decided upon. Delphi was in no sense a 'think-tank' to which information flowed from throughout the Greek world on the basis of which the Delphic priests could recommend particular sites. Delphi could also be asked to settle quarrels as to who had founded a city. When the inhabitants – Athenians, Peloponnesians and other Greeks – of Thourioi, founded in 444/3, inquired about who should be honoured as the city's oikistes, Apollo pronounced that *he* be honoured as 'Founder'. In a similar possibly apocryphal case the two founders of Drepanon, later Zankle, inquired after which of them the colony should be named, but were told neither.<sup>177</sup>

The oracle had numerous questions put to it on specific religious matters. The Athenian request that all Greek states send first-fruits of their agricultural produce to Eleusis had the sanction of Delphi, and presumably a question about this had been put by the Athenians to the Pythia. The long-sacred law from Cyrene had Delphi's approval. When Kleisthenes of Sikyon went to Delphi to ask if he could expel the Argive hero Adrastos from Sikyon because of his own anti-Argive feelings, Delphi would not allow him to do so. This did not prevent Kleisthenes from introducing the cult of the hero Melanippos – Adrastos' enemy – to Sikyon, and he transferred to him the honours formerly paid to Adrastos. The Athenians had expelled the Delians from Delos in 422 but brought them back again in 421 both because of the disasters they had suffered in battles and because of a Delphic oracle. The Athenians put the question about the cultivation of Eleusinian sacred land to Delphi.<sup>178</sup> Answers to questions about famines and plagues might

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

involve performing religious rites, sometimes establishing the cult of a hero (which might involve finding his bones), making sacrifices, or setting up statues of particular deities.<sup>179</sup> The oracle was consulted on constitutional matters, and the god was asked to give blessing to political changes, such as the introduction of a new constitution at Sparta. The Pythia chose the ten eponymous heroes for Kleisthenes' ten new tribes at Attica out of a submitted list of 100, clearly giving the god's approval to the new, democratic, constitution of Athens.<sup>180</sup>

In 432 the Spartans sent an embassy to Delphi to ask 'the god' whether they should go to war against the Athenians; the reply was that they would be victorious if they waged war with all their strength, introducing an element of qualification. Thucydides writes 'so it is said' when giving the reply of the Pythia, perhaps indicating that he did not think this to be the answer which the Pythia gave. The form of the inquiry, given Thucydides' narrative, may well have been 'since the treaty has been broken and the Athenians are in the wrong, would it be better for the Spartans to go to war?' When the oracle of Zeus at Olympia agreed with Agesipolis that it was pious not to accept the truce proclaimed by the Argives, he then travelled to Delphi and asked Apollo if he was of the same opinion as his father, and he was. Agesipolis had left the Pythia little choice as to her reply.<sup>181</sup>

Setting out on a journey might be an occasion for consulting Delphi: Xenophon asked Apollo 'to which of the gods sacrificing and praying' would he have success in Cyrus' expedition and return home safely. Socrates reprimanded him on his return from Delphi as he ought first to have asked whether to go or not. But Xenophon, and not Socrates, acted in the usual way: the lead tablets from Dodona indicate that an inquirer had often chosen a specific course of action, and wanted to know to which god to sacrifice and pray for success.<sup>182</sup>

The oracle is sometimes stated to have been obscure. Croesus was said to have been told by the Pythia that if he crossed the river Halys and attacked the Persians he would destroy a mighty empire. This encouraged him, but it was his own empire which was destroyed. This is the classic example of the 'ambiguous' oracle, though when Croesus later sent an embassy to Delphi to ask how such an oracle could be given, the oracle said that he ought to have asked a second question, as to what empire was meant. Most questions asked of a personal nature were more

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

straightforward, and even most state matters were, with inquirers posing questions in such a way as to make the answer they wanted clear. Several problems needed only ritual prescriptions. Many of the inquiries were 'Is it better and preferable to——?', and usually the answer was 'Yes', with the consultant receiving the answer they had wished for. But political problems sometimes were difficult, and met with a guarded or ambiguous response which the inquirer had to interpret.<sup>183</sup>

It has been incorrectly stated that Delphi lost prestige after the Persian Wars because the oracle medised.<sup>184</sup> Oracles advising states not to become involved in the war against the Persians are recorded by Herodotos,<sup>185</sup> but it is possible to view the oracle's behaviour as acceptable: the Persians were seemingly invincible, and to encourage neutrality or flight could be interpreted as the best advice that could be given. The Athenians consulted the oracle about what to do in the face of the Persian invasion of 480 and were told to flee. This was not the answer which they wanted, so they asked for a second oracle, which was more positive and held out hope. If these two oracles are historical, it indicates that the Pythia had at first perhaps misunderstood the answer which the Athenians wanted, and when she delivered the second oracle she was more fully apprised of the response they required: an oracle which would allow Themistokles to persuade the Athenians to take to their 'wooden walls', their navy.<sup>186</sup> But the first oracle does deal with a course of action being discussed at Athens, flight, and the second offers the options of holding out in Athens or trusting in the navy, both also under discussion at Athens. There was also an oracle given to encourage the Greeks before the battle of Artemision, to trust in the winds; Herodotos notes this oracle gave great encouragement to the Greeks.<sup>187</sup> The 'medising' assessment is contradicted by the numerous dedications made by the Greeks for their victory over the Persians, some of them even during the war when the outcome was not yet clear, and the oracle was consulted after the battle of Plataea in 479 as to the correct manner in which to sacrifice to the gods. Fire at Delphi had a sacred character: after the battle of Plataea in 479, all fire throughout Greece was extinguished and rekindled from the public hearth at Delphi, and delegations of theoroi must have been sent by states throughout Greece for this purpose.<sup>188</sup>

### Didyma

The history of the oracle of Apollo at Didyma in Asia Minor began in the archaic period, and inscribed oracular responses from that period survive, in addition to oracles recorded by Herodotos.<sup>189</sup> In this period Didyma was referred to as Branchidai. The same name, Branchidai, also referred to those in charge of the oracle at Didyma, and the site took its name from them; they were probably a priestly family or perhaps a cult association. Miletos, 16½ kilometres away, and linked to Didyma by a Sacred Way, played the main role in the administration of the oracle.<sup>190</sup>

The operation of the oracle was interrupted in 494 when Didyma was destroyed by the Persians, and the Branchidai disappeared with the destruction of the sanctuary. Herodotos writes that until this time all the Ionians and Aeolians of Asia Minor customarily consulted the oracle at Didyma.<sup>191</sup> Even though the temple at Didyma was destroyed, cult activities continued there, and the Molpoi regularly conducted a procession from Miletos to Didyma from at least 479 and possibly earlier.<sup>192</sup>

The refounding of the oracle took place between 334 when Alexander successfully besieged Miletos, and 331, in which year Milesian envoys brought him oracles from Didyma while he was at Memphis in Egypt.<sup>193</sup> The Milesians proceeded to rebuild the temple on a massive scale, and in fact it was never fully completed: its base is 118 by 51 metres, with 20-metre high columns, and it has a double row of ten by twenty-one columns in the peristyle. The pronaos has twelve columns, and is 15 by 14 metres. Doors on the left and right in the pronaos enter into the vaulted tunnels leading down into the adyton, the inner chamber of the temple, in which a chamber, the naiskos, stands fronted with four columns. Stairs up from the adyton lead back to the east chamber.

The 'prophetes' at Didyma, an annual office, did not fulfil an oracular function, but like the priests at Delphi was present at oracular sessions; the prophetes generally left an inscribed record that he had held office.<sup>194</sup> As at Delphi, the inquirer received a response from a female priestess.<sup>195</sup> Much of the information about the actual working of the oracle comes from Iamblichos, in the third century AD, but his account seems plausible and may reflect much earlier practice.

The consultants made sacrifices beforehand, perhaps on the altar in front of the temple, or inside, as at Delphi; baths and a three-



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

day fast were required of the priestess before the consultation. Iamblichos mentions four procedures: the priestess held a wand, sat on an 'axon' (probably the equivalent of the Delphic tripod), wet her feet or hem, and inhaled the steam (or vapour?) of the water, the last perhaps referring, Fontenrose suggests, to 'an imaginary vapor of divine power'. She may have stood or sat in the east chamber, and looked down upon the consultant in the adyton. One thing is clear: the priestess at Didyma is nowhere depicted in the manic way in which the Delphic priestess sometimes was, and this is a clear guide to oracular procedure at oracular centres – such as at Delos, Dodona, Claros and others. Those giving the oracles were mantic but not manic.<sup>196</sup> Presumably the consultants, attended by the prophetes and other temple staff, made their way from the pronaos down one of the vaulted chambers into the adyton, put their question and received a reply from the priestess. How often she could be consulted is unknown, though the three-day preparatory period is an important factor here.

A major difference in procedure from Delphi is that the inquirers received a written copy of their oracle. In fact, many of the oracles were inscribed at Didyma, a practice begun in the archaic period and which continued with the re-establishment of the oracle (similarly at Delphi, there are some examples of inscribed oracles). There was a building called the chresmographion, and here the consultants may have received a written copy of their oracle.<sup>197</sup> Promanteia was common at Delphi, but there is only one instance of it at Didyma, where it was granted to Antiochos I and his descendants. This may well have been an extraordinary honour given only once, in imitation of Delphic procedure, and promanteia was perhaps not customary at Didyma.<sup>198</sup>

The clientele of the re-established oracle matched that which it had prior to 494: this was an oracle for the islanders and Asia Minor. Mainland Greeks, not surprisingly, preferred Delphi and Dodona. But the main consultants were the Milesians themselves: three quarters of the surviving responses are for Milesians.<sup>199</sup> In this sense it was very different from panhellenic Delphi, and more like Dodona, where many of the consultants were the local people. Clearly the primary function of this oracle was to assist the local community, but it did also serve a wider area. The topics include religious, political and personal questions. Oracles at Didyma

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

tended to be in verse, and there were no ambiguous oracles; this reinforces a conclusion that can be drawn about Delphi, that oracles were straightforward answers, and 'ambiguous' oracles were in the minority, and many of them are likely to be unhistorical or legendary. In answer to questions oracles gave straightforward answers, and probably in nearly every case the one that the pilgrim inquirer expected. In reply to a question from the builders of the Milesian theatre whether to work on the arches of the theatre of Miletos or to consider other work, the priestess commanded them to work on the arches *and* to pray to Pallas Tritogeneia and strong Herakles.<sup>200</sup> In this particular oracle, as in others, it is clear that the course of action preferred by the consultants is given in detail, and the alternative is only sketched – 'another job'. The preference of the inquirer, to work on the arches, is made clear by the way in which the question was asked. The oracle validates this as a decision and names the gods who, if supplicated, will bless the project. If the inquirer was wavering, he now had the support of the oracle.

#### Claros

From its refoundation, Didyma was the primary oracular centre in Asia Minor, but a rival emerged in the Roman period at Claros, where there was an oracle of the god Apollo. A male prophet presided: the oracular session was at night, before which the prophet fasted for a day and a night, and Iamblichos mentions that many preliminary rites were performed. The prophet saw the consultants, but was not visible to them when he delivered the oracle, suggesting that he retired to the subterranean chamber of the temple.

States consulting the oracle inscribed the responses on the wall of the temple. The evidence of these inscriptions of the second and third centuries AD indicates that cities of the Black Sea, and cities such as Phokaia in Asia Minor, and the island of Chios, but not the cities of mainland Greece, consulted the oracle, and Parke has suggested that the states which did not consult Didyma consulted Claros, and vice versa.<sup>201</sup>

### Dodona

The story of the seven oracles to which Croesus sent his embassies suggests that Dodona was an important oracle of Zeus in the fifth century, when Herodotos records this story. Delphi and Dodona, as this story indicates, were rivals: Delphi passed Croesus' test, while Dodona failed. But Delphi and Dodona could be consulted on the same subject.<sup>202</sup> 'Double' consultations involving two oracles are known: Euripides has Xouthos consult the oracle of Trophonios at Lebadeia before proceeding to consult the Delphic oracle.<sup>203</sup> Agesipolis wishing to invade Argos in 388/7 consulted the oracle of Zeus at Olympia, and after receiving a favourable reply went to Delphi and consulted the oracle there as well.<sup>204</sup> Similarly, Lysander attempted to bribe the oracles at Delphi, Dodona and Siwah.<sup>205</sup>

While it is clear that Delphi was consulted not only by important state delegations but also by private individuals, most of our evidence from Delphi does concern state matters; this may be partly due to the vagaries of the evidence, in that political questions attracted more interest in the sources but it is also quite clear that in the classical period, Delphi's main 'business' was in dealing with important matters of state. Dodona was also consulted by states on important matters, such as when the Corcyraeans inquired (c. 450–404 BC) 'to what god or hero' they might sacrifice and pray that 'they may dwell in the fairest and best way both now and in time to come', and on another occasion how 'they may be of one mind for their good', probably referring to their political difficulties in the second half of the fifth century. They continued to consult the oracle in the third century (no. 6);<sup>206</sup> the geographical proximity of the island to Dodona suggests that they would have been regular inquirers. The people of Dodona even asked whether the god sent a storm because of someone's impurity(!).<sup>207</sup> Sparta certainly consulted the oracle,<sup>208</sup> and while Athens on the whole does seem to have consulted Delphi, the Athenians may have preferred Dodona to Delphi at some stages of the Peloponnesian War.<sup>209</sup> As with Didyma and Claros, Dodona was mainly an oracle serving a limited geographical area, and only occasionally attracted interest from Athens and Sparta. However, Delphi, Dodona and Siwah are mentioned by Aristophanes and Plato as being on the same footing.<sup>210</sup>

But at Dodona the fact that many of the inquiries were written

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

down on lead tablets upon which were engraved questions for Zeus (Naos), and sometimes also for Dione, means that numerous private inquiries have been preserved.<sup>211</sup> Dodona appears to have dealt more with personal matters than with state ones: the published lead tablets from Dodona (many hundreds await publication) have only nine public problems posed as questions, and about seventy private inquiries.

It is these lead tablets more than anything else which illustrate the degree of the dependence of the Greeks on divination, and the oracles range over a wide variety of questions covering numerous spheres of human activity. Hesiod had pointed to the correct omens needed for marriage, but the Dodona tablets reveal that advice was even sought on whom to marry: one consultant, Geriton, asked Zeus whether he should take a wife, while Herakleidas asked whether his wife Aigle would have children. The same question was posed by Kallikrates concerning Nike, and by other husbands concerning their wives, and another tablet reveals the anxiety husbands felt about the legitimacy of the children their wives bore: Lysanias wished to know whether the pregnant Annyla was carrying his child (nos 5–9). Health was also a matter for oracular inquiry: one Thrasyboulos asks ‘by sacrificing and appeasing which god will he become healthier as to his eyes?’ (no. 14).

The oracle is also asked to help with the recovery of stolen property: one tablet names several possible kidnappers of a slave and asks the god who was responsible, another inquires about the theft of some blankets and pillows, and another about cloth (nos 26, 27, 29). One Alkinoos asks advice about whether Nikeas should construct the workshop (no. 21). Interestingly, and overlooked in discussions of social history, are the questions concerning changes of livelihood and abodes: clearly there was more movement, both physically and from trade to trade, than is often assumed. Kleotas asks if it is ‘better and profitable for him to keep sheep’ (no. 17); a change of livelihood is also the subject of an inquiry (no. 18); another wants to know whether being a merchant will prove profitable (no. 19); another consultant asks whether he should purchase ‘the house and land’ (no. 25). These questions are generally framed as ‘will it be better and more good?’ to do a certain thing. In addition to these very specific inquiries, there are the questions put to the god of a much more general nature: ‘what do I do to make my life better?’ (no. 16), which seems to indicate a

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

desire to seek guidance from the gods as to how to live in order to avoid calamity.

Dodona is first mentioned in the *Iliad*: Achilles refers to the male Selloi of unwashed feet who slept on the ground and were Zeus' 'interpreters', but they are not heard of in the classical period, and in the *Odyssey*, the will of Zeus is heard 'from the oak'; a fragment of Hesiod also gives the oak as the source of prophecy.<sup>212</sup> But in the classical period the situation had changed: Herodotos mentions three priestesses (and does not mention the Selloi), and Strabo comments on the fact that the 'interpreters' mentioned in Homer had been replaced by three women. Herodotos relates a tale that linked Dodona and Siwah. A pair of black doves flew away from Thebes in Egypt, one to Siwah, and one to Dodona: this second one landed in an oak, and in human voice commanded an oracle of Zeus to be founded. This is probably an aetiological myth dating to the time of change from the Selloi to the three priestesses. Herodotos mentions the priestesses by order of age, perhaps indicating a sequence of succession and apprenticeship.<sup>213</sup>

The lead tablets discussed above date from the end of the late sixth century onwards. The procedure associated with them is unknown. They contain questions about specific problems or contemplated activities, and they are inscribed on tablets (some of which were erased and reused). Answers may well have been provided by lot,<sup>214</sup> and some questions do require simply a 'yes' or 'no' which could be provided by the use of a lot system. However, the questions which ask to 'which god' the inquirer should sacrifice presuppose a verbal response, and the priestesses may have been prophetic in the same sense as the Pythia at Delphi and the priestess at Didyma.

Most of the personal questions would seem to require a 'yes' or 'no' (nos 6, 7, 10, 11, 13), but some inquiries suggest that the oracle may have qualified the answer in some way with ritual advice: 'Kallikrates asks the god whether I will have offspring from Nike the wife whom I have by remaining with her and praying to which gods?', and in another example, 'Anaxippos asks Zeus Naos and Dione concerning male offspring from Philista his wife, by praying to which of the gods shall I fare best and most well?' (nos 8-9). In reply, the priestess will have advised which god or gods it was necessary to supplicate in order to achieve the required result. This is why, of course, the reliability of oracular

#### MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

centres is not doubted: they do not make rash promises about whether male offspring will be born, but put the 'onus' on the inquirer and the gods.

A common phrasing of questions at Dodona is, 'by praying to which gods?' will a desired result be achieved (no. 9; see also 1–5, 12, 14). Nikokrateia asks to which gods must she sacrifice in order to get better (no. 15). Because there were many gods the inquirers sought advice about how to invoke the god who would be interested in their problem. As at Didyma, the responses were unambiguous. Dodona may have been in a very real sense an oracle of the ordinary person, and we can assume that many local oracles fulfilled this very function, providing concrete advice to the members of the local community on important decisions which individuals had to make. It was hazardous to undertake activities without the support of the gods. But individuals were also anxious about the future and wanted to know what it held for them. It was important to determine which gods to sacrifice to in order to achieve a certain outcome and in this way the inquirer sought reassurance and assistance from the gods.

#### Some lesser known oracles

Oracles at Olympia were obtained by sacrifice. When Agesipolis asked Zeus whether or not it was pious to ignore the truce which the Argives had speciously proclaimed, the oracle was obtained through the results of an examination of the entrails of the sacrifice. The sacrificial method was also used at the oracle of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes; this was one of the oracles consulted by Mys during the Second Persian War. Little is known of the oracle of Apollo at Abai in Phokis; it was rich with treasures and dedications, and was plundered by the Persians in 480. The oracle there functioned in Herodotos' time, for it was one of the oracles said to have been consulted by Croesus, and was consulted by the Thebans before the battle of Leuktra. The Phokians dedicated war-booty there. Apollo also had an oracle at Ptoios in Boeotia; Boeotians and Athenians made dedications at this oracle. The priest gave verbal answers, and at the consultation made by Mys his Theban guides had brought a tablet on which to write down the reply.<sup>215</sup>

## PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

### CONCLUSION

The pious need for initiations, cures and oracles drew Greeks to panhellenic sanctuaries where they invoked the gods to meet their particular needs. The wide range of questions asked at oracles, the cures sought at healing sanctuaries, and the need for reassurance about the life after death, indicate the very great degree to which the Greeks viewed the gods as intervening in the lives of individuals and in the affairs of the state.

## PILGRIMAGE DESTINATIONS II: CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

In ancient Greece there were four main panhellenic festivals which involved athletic, musical and equestrian competitions: the Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia and Nemea, in descending order of importance. These were the sacred contests (*agones hieroi*), also called the crown contests (*agones stephanitai*), where the reward for the victor was a wreath ('crown') rather than money or material prizes. These four main festivals occurred on a regular cycle. The Olympia was a penteteric event, that is, occurring every four years (the Greeks counted inclusively, and penteteric means every fifth year); the festival took place in mid-summer, and coincided with the rising of the full moon.<sup>1</sup> The period from one celebration of the Olympia to the next was known as an Olympiad, and was often used for dating events. For example, the time for renewing treaties could be tied to festivals: the alliance between Athens and Argos in 420 was to be renewed thirty days before the Olympic festival, and ten days before the Great Panathenaia. Several copies of the treaty were to be set up, with one at Olympia.<sup>2</sup> The Pythia was also celebrated every four years, in the third year of an Olympic cycle, and the Nemea and Isthmia occurred every two years, so the cycle was as follows:

Year 1	Isthmia (April/May)
	Olympia (July/August)
Year 2	Nemea (July/August)
Year 3	Isthmia (April/May)
	Pythia (July/August)
Year 4	Nemea (July/August).

Starting with the Olympia in the first year of an Olympiad, or



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

with the Pythia in the third year of an Olympiad, it was possible to compete at and attend all of the four within a space of twenty-five months. Many athletes, in fact, were victorious in all four festivals and were known as *periodonikai* (sing.: *periodonikes*). Milon of Kroton in Italy was a *periodonikes* five times in the sixth century. There is only one known *periodonikes* from Athens prior to the hellenistic period, Kallias, son of Didymios, with a victory at Olympia (472 BC), two at the Pythia, five at Isthmia, and four at Nemea (and one at the Great Panathenaia).<sup>3</sup> There could be several generations of victors in a single family, such as the Oligaithidai of Corinth, whose victories Pindar describes in the thirteenth Olympian victory ode. The family of Diagoras of Rhodes had victors in several generations in the fifth and fourth centuries: Diagoras himself was victorious at Olympia, as later were his three sons; two grandsons, sons of Diagoras' two daughters, also won victories in the fifth and fourth centuries. The Timodemidai of Athens won several victories in the fifth century: four at the Pythia, eight at the Isthmia, and seven at Nemea; the Bassidai of Aegina had twenty-five victories.<sup>4</sup>

Three of the festivals were named for their locations: the Olympia, Nemea, and Isthmia (on the isthmus between the Peloponnese and northern Greece); the Pythia was held at Delphi and was named after the serpent, Python, which Apollo slew there. The order of the four major contests is generally given in inscriptions and sources as Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia and Nemea, and the Panathenaia when mentioned in victory inscriptions usually follows these four.<sup>5</sup>

There were musical and sporting contests at most festivals: but at Olympia there were no musical events,<sup>6</sup> while at Delphi, although there were athletic events, it was the musical competitions which were the most important. The sporting events were divided into equestrian events, such as chariot- and horse-racing, and the events in which the contestants competed naked: these were the gymnastic events (*gymnos*: naked), and the Greeks ran, wrestled, jumped and competed in all athletic events in the nude: it was the mark of the barbarian to be clothed for such activities.<sup>7</sup>

The four-horse chariot-race was a major feature of these festivals, and the most spectacular of the events. Chariot-racing was an aristocratic pursuit, and the driver was usually not the owner of the horses and chariot; tyrants from Sicily sent *theoroi* and chariots to compete, especially to Olympia and Delphi. Running

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

was the first event introduced at Olympia, and the stadion, or stade, was a race over some 600 feet. There was wrestling and boxing, while the pentathlon consisted of five events: running, jumping, discus, javelin and wrestling. The pankration ('all powerful') was a rougher type of wrestling, with everything allowed except biting and gouging.<sup>8</sup> There was also a race in armour. Festivals might also have various other events (the Panathenaia included a boat-race). The prize list for the Panathenaia at Athens lists musical events: playing the kithara (lyre) while singing, or singing to the accompaniment of a kithara, or playing the aulos (flute) or kithara solo; the solo aulos and kithara contest is specified as being for men, so perhaps there was another age category or categories, of boys and/or youths. An inscription on a red-figure pelike depicts a kithara player with four Nikai, one for each of the contests at which the kithara player was victorious: the Panathenaia, the festival at Marathon, and the Nemea and the Isthmia.<sup>9</sup>

The Panathenaia was celebrated by the Athenians every year but with particular significance every four years as the Great Panathenaia. It offered material prizes and not wreaths, did not belong to the category of the crown contests, and does not seem to have been as popular as the other four major festivals. While not attaining the prestige of the other four, the prizes offered at the Panathenaia, olive-oil and money, encouraged participation by citizens from other states.<sup>10</sup> In addition, there were contests, the Eleusinia, held at Eleusis every four years, as well as various other, non-panhellenic, festivals which involved athletics and which, while not attracting competitors from all over the Greek world, did draw them from many Greek cities. The Asklepieia at Epidauros (held every four years) was held nine days after the biennial Isthmian festival,<sup>11</sup> so athletes were on a relatively tight schedule in this case. Athletes who took their 'careers' seriously would obviously attend as many athletic festivals as possible. Theogenes of Thasos had 1,400 victories in the early fifth century; his inscribed list of victories at Delphi includes the important festivals of the Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia, and Nemea, but also of Argos; obviously he had victories at many other festivals as well.<sup>12</sup>

The special significance of the four panhellenic events is made particularly clear by Pindar and Bacchylides, who wrote epinician odes – victory odes – for victors in the Olympian, Pythian, Isthmian and Nemean contests. Some of the odes are short, such as

Pindar's *Olympian* 11 and *Pythian* 6, and perhaps these were to be sung at the festival site itself. In some cases, there was an epinician ode sung at the festival site, and another at the victor's home. For example, Pindar's *Olympian* 11 was sung at Olympia in honour of Hagesidamos, winner in the boy's boxing match in 476, while *Olympian* 10, also in his honour, was sung later in Lokri Epizephyrii in southern Italy. Bacchylides' second victory ode is a short version for Argeios of Keos performed at Isthmia while his first is a longer version to be performed at Keos. Not only the victors but their trainers might be praised; for example, Ilaos, the trainer of Hagesidamos, is praised along with the victor.<sup>13</sup> Pindar (*O.* 1, *P.* 1, 2, 3) and Bacchylides (3, 4, 5) both wrote in honour of victories by Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, at Olympia and Delphi; Pindar's *Olympian* 1 and Bacchylides 5 were for the same Olympic chariot-race victory in 476, and Pindar's *Pythian* 1 and Bacchylides 4 were similarly both for Hiero's chariot-race victory at Delphi in 470.

Pindar mentions several festivals at which there were contests which were clearly not of the same panhellenic status as the Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia and Nemea, but which attracted competitors from many states: these were held at Achaean cities, Arcadia, Argos (the Heraia), Eleusis, Epidauros, Euboia, Kleitor, Lykaion, Marathon, Megara, Orchomenos (Boeotia), Pellana, Phylake, Sikyon, Tegea and Thebes, where there were also the contests at the 'tomb of Iolaos', while Xenophon of Corinth had won victories at the 'cities adorned with wealth' under lofty Etna in Sicily. The rarity of the mention of Sicilian contests suggests that while they existed, they were not frequently attended by non-Sicilians.<sup>14</sup> Other panhellenic festivals were the Amphiaraia at Oropos, the Hekatomboia in Argos, and the Eleutheria at Plataea,<sup>15</sup> as well as the festivals inaugurated in the hellenistic period: the Didymeia at Didyma, the Leukophryena at Magnesia, the Asklepieia on Kos, the Ptolemaia at Alexandria in Egypt, and the Soteria at Delphi. An individual athlete could compete in several of these festivals, like Herodotos of Thebes, who was victorious in the chariot-race at Isthmia in 458(?) BC, where he drove the chariot himself, and had also competed at Orchomenos (Boeotia), Eleusis, Euboia and Phylake (Thessaly).<sup>16</sup>

The major panhellenic contests were joined in the hellenistic and Roman periods by festivals that sought to be accepted as their equivalent: contests were modelled on the programmes and

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

character of the major panhellenic festivals (with similar events, age categories, rules and prizes), and these contests were known as *isolympion*, 'equal to the Olympics' or *isopythion*, 'equal to the Pythian contests'.<sup>17</sup> The similarities were not always exact; for example, the *isolympion* Sebasta in Naples provided daily allowances for competitors and material prizes which the Olympia did not.<sup>18</sup>

As well as the various contests there were other unofficial activities. Festivals provided an attractive venue for speakers as large numbers of people gathered there. Dio Chrysostom referred to those who recited tragedies, epics and prose at *panegyreis* – festivals – and whom one heard even if one did not want to. The Sicilian sophist Gorgias delivered orations at *panegyreis*, including a Pythian Oration and an Olympic Oration, which sought to convince the Greeks to attack the Persians, rather than each other. The Athenian orator Lysias delivered a speech against Dionysios of Syracuse at Olympia. Herodotos was said to have made his first public appearance at Olympia and gained his reputation there, so that others followed his example and read their works at the Olympic festival before the crowds. Philosophers delivered speeches at festivals, and sophists presented their cases: Plato's dialogues on the sophist Hippias have him declaiming at Olympia on a variety of subjects, and fielding questions from his audience. By virtue of being public places drawing large crowds, festivals, particularly the panhellenic ones, attracted those who wished to publicise their work.<sup>19</sup> It was also a place where public figures could be seen. When Themistokles came to the festival in 476, the crowds paid no further attention to the contests but spent their time admiring and pointing him out.<sup>20</sup>

#### THE RELIGIOUS NATURE OF THE CONTESTS

All of these festivals involving competitions were primarily religious events to honour the god or hero to whom the festival was dedicated and travelling to and attending a festival involving such contests was a pilgrimage. Thucydides in giving the terms of the Peace of Nikias in 421 writes of the 'common shrines' and lists the activities there as sacrifice, consulting the oracles and 'watching'. The inclusion of spectating in the same category as these other two clearly religious activities is important. The 'common shrines' which the treaty dealt with will have been

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

Olympia, Delphi, Isthmia and Nemea in particular and the treaty indicates that going to these shrines to see athletes, chariot-races and musical competitions was a religious activity, in the same sense that making a sacrifice while at Olympia was a religious activity. While the panhellenic festivals centred around athletic, equestrian and musical contests these competitions took place within a religious framework, and they were festivals of the gods in every sense.

The panhellenic festivals each had myths associated with them which gave them a divine 'pedigree' and claimed that the gods were associated in their foundation, and included gods and heroes as original competitors. Each festival was in honour of a god: Zeus for the Olympic and Nemean, Poseidon for the Isthmian, and Apollo for the Pythian festival, held at the site of his most important oracle, Delphi. The heroes Opheltes and Melicertes were also associated with the Nemean and Isthmian festivals respectively; Pelops had a hero cult at Olympia. The connection with heroes points to a funerary origin for the contests, and the dual patronage of festivals, between gods and heroes, points to the overlaying of old beliefs with new.

According to the myths surrounding the Olympic festival, Iphitos re-established the Olympic festival and an ekecheiria, sacred truce, on the advice of the Delphic oracle. Zeus himself established the original contests revived by Iphitos: Pausanias writes that some say that Zeus and Kronos wrestled for supremacy, others that Zeus established the contests to celebrate his victory over Kronos; the hill at Olympia was named after Kronos. The gods actually competed and Apollo beat Hermes there at running and Ares in the boxing contest.<sup>21</sup>

The gods were anthropomorphic in nature, and the Greeks believed that their gods took delight in the same things that mortals enjoyed: one of the roles of these contests was to please the gods, who were spectators just like the human onlookers. This is made explicit by the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* in describing the festival celebrated by the Ionians on the island of Delos, which was sacred to Apollo, where Apollo was said to delight in the festivities.<sup>22</sup> The boxing, dancing and singing were enjoyed by the pilgrims, who had travelled to Delos, but it is clear that the competitions were primarily held to give pleasure to the god Apollo.

The Olympic festival, which tends to be thought of as a sporting event, was not viewed in the same way by the ancients. Pausanias,

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

a pious Greek, pairs the Eleusinian Mysteries and the Olympic contests as the two main Greek religious events, stating that heaven had particular concern for them.<sup>23</sup> At the Olympic festival, the first day of the proceedings began with devotions to its patron, the god Zeus, with the focus on sacrifices (originally the festival was a one-day affair but expanded eventually to five days); on the third day of the festival, the main sacrifice occurred, the hecatomb, in which one hundred beasts were sacrificed at the altar of Zeus. This altar consisted of the ash of previous sacrifices,<sup>24</sup> and there was such an accumulation of these ashes that in the second century AD Pausanias records that the altar was 22 feet high. The huge ash altar at Olympia attests to a great deal of sacrificial activity, not all of it, of course, during the Olympic festival: there were regular sacrifices conducted at Olympia by the Eleians, and ash from the perpetual fire in the prytaneion was also placed on the mound. In addition, there were various other altars to Zeus in the Olympic sanctuary. There was, for example, a round altar in front of the bouleuterion, where the Olympic oath was sworn to Zeus Horkios. Olympia attracted thousands of pilgrim spectators (with women but not virgins being excluded) every four years, and the altars of Olympia must have been a scene of unceasing butchery as the pious offered sacrifice to their most important deity, Zeus. Fortunately, the flies were said to flee whenever it was the time of Zeus' festival.<sup>25</sup>

The altars at two of the other panhellenic festivals, Nemea and Isthmia, were also large: 40 metres in length at the Isthmia and at least 41 metres at Nemea. This indicates that there was a great deal of sacrificial activity at these sites – particularly Nemea which would only have been used on a large scale every two years – which emphasises the religious character of these festivals. It is possible that instead of the whole altar being in use at any one time, that different sections of the altars were for different ceremonies during the festival; however the length probably allowed for several pilgrims to make sacrifices simultaneously. The earth and small pieces of burnt bone which lie in bands beside the altar at Nemea indicate that the debris of the sacrifices from around the altar was swept up on a regular basis. The fact that the altar at Nemea was extended on several occasions seems to suggest an increasing number of sacrifices over time.<sup>26</sup> At the Olympic festival, the priestess of Demeter Chamyne sat on an altar of white

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

marble opposite the seat of the hellanodikai, and watched the contests.<sup>27</sup>

Kleosthenes from Epidamnos in dedicating a statue group at Olympia referred to his victory as taking place at 'the fair contest of Zeus'. However, the various dedications made to the gods in return for victories at the contests need not necessarily point to a religious nature for the contests, because the Greeks made thanksgiving offerings to the gods for their help in all aspects of human endeavour, such as help in war and personal sickness. However, in dealing with the cases involving the bribing of competitors at Olympia, Pausanias wonders that anyone could show so little respect to Zeus. Those found guilty of bribery were fined, and with the money statues of Zeus (Zanes) were made, stressing the link between the competitions and their patron Zeus. One of the statues of Zeus dedicated from fines paid by athletes who had bribed fellow competitors had an inscription which read that it was erected 'out of respect for the god', by the piety of the Eleians, and to be a 'terror' to athletes who broke the laws.<sup>28</sup>

The Achaeans inquired of Delphi in the eightieth Olympiad (460–457) why they were no longer successful in the Olympic contests and were told that it was because their last victor, Oibotas, had won the stade in 756 but received no honour from the Achaeans, and so had invoked a curse that no other Achaean win an Olympic victory; the Achaeans then dedicated a statue of him at Olympia. Even in Pausanias' time the Achaean competitors sacrificed to Oibotas, and if victorious placed a wreath on his statue at Olympia.<sup>29</sup> Athletes seem to have commonly prayed for victory. The fifth-century statue of Anaxandros, victorious in the chariot-race at Olympia, is represented 'praying to the god'. Similarly, the statue of Diagoras of Rhodes had its right arm raised, signifying prayer.<sup>30</sup>

#### OLYMPIA

The best known of the panhellenic festivals were the Olympic contests, which were celebrated at Olympia (occasionally referred to as Pisa), near Elis in the Peloponnese. The Olympics had a long tradition, and originated as local contests which attracted an increasing number of competitors and spectators from neighbouring areas, and gradually developed panhellenic status. While the traditional date for the establishment of the Olympic festival

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

was 776, it is more probable that the seventh century saw the Olympics developing panhellenic status to the point where in the early sixth century three other festivals, the Pythia at Delphi, the Isthmia and the Nemea underwent formal reorganisation to 'create' panhellenic competitions, probably in emulation of the Olympic festival.<sup>31</sup> The central myth surrounding the Olympic festival concerned Pelops, who won his bride Hippodameia by killing her father Oinomaos by bribing Oinomaos' driver Myrtilos to remove the linchpins from his chariot axles and replace them with wax ones. Oinomaos had set a test for Hippodameia's suitors: he gave them a head start in a long chariot-race from Pisa near Olympia to the Isthmus in which they took Hippodameia in their chariots while he pursued them: if he caught up with the suitor's chariot he speared him; in this way, he had killed twelve or thirteen previous suitors. This aetiological myth concerns the introduction of chariot-racing (in 680), but the stade was the original contest.<sup>32</sup>

The contests were held at the sanctuary of Zeus. Within the Altis ('grove') were the temples of Zeus and Hera, a shrine to Pelops, and numerous altars. Nearby were the stadium, gymnasium, palaestra (wrestling building), and the Leonidaion, where official delegations stayed. The site at Olympia was dominated by the great temple of Zeus, which housed one of the seven wonders of the world: the seated statue of Zeus by Pheidias. The start of the chariot-race between Oinomaos and Pelops is depicted on the east pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, and Raschke notes that the various scenes on the pediments, the fight between the Lapiths and the Centaurs, the race between Oinomaos and Pelops, and the depiction on the metopes (the areas, sculptured in this case, between the triglyphs, the three-grooved slabs of stone, in a Doric frieze) of the labours of Herakles, stress agonistic (competitive) themes, with the temple sculpture mirroring the contests of the competitors.<sup>33</sup>

The evidence of Pindar's odes for victors in the contests, the list of Olympic victors given by Sextus Africanus and those mentioned by Pausanias and other sources give a very clear indication of the range of places from which athletes came to Olympia for the competitions, often bringing their trainers and members of their families. Competitors came not only from the Greek cities of Asia Minor, Italy and Sicily, but also included Greeks from Egypt and Cyrene.<sup>34</sup>

Both competitors and spectators had to endure various hardships



while at Olympia.<sup>35</sup> The banks of the stadium were earthen and there were no seats. The summer timing of this festival ensured fine weather but also that it was hot: the Stoic philosopher Epictetus complained of the heat, the crowds, the difficulties of bathing, perspiration, the noise, and other problems, but that these were endured because of the excitement of the contests.<sup>36</sup> The weather was generally hot and sweaty, but whereas Anacharsis complained of the terrible heat at the stadium, he noted that Solon was not even sweating. Similarly, there was the story that the Ionic philosopher Thales died of thirst and heat stroke while watching athletic contests (but Olympia is not specified).<sup>37</sup> A master could even threaten his slave with a visit to Olympia as a punishment, where he would be scorched by the sun while watching the contests.<sup>38</sup>

Most spectators sacrificed at the great altar of Zeus during the five day period of the festival, especially on the third day, and visited the great temple of Zeus and Pheidias' statue there. The programme of events at Olympia evolved over time; some events, however, were added only to be dropped later, such as the pentathlon for boys introduced in 628 at Olympia but immediately deleted from the programme, or the *apene* (mule-cart race) introduced in 500 and the *kalpe* (a race with mares in which for the last lap the riders jumped off and ran alongside the horses) introduced in 496. Both were dropped in 444: lack of crowd interest or competitors presumably explains these deletions.<sup>39</sup>

The number of competitors in some events at Olympia was small. For example, in 338 there were only four competitors for the boxing. This was part of a phenomenon at other festivals as well: contestants might withdraw when they saw the competition. Victors might boast that they had won *akoniti*, 'without dust'; that is, without fighting. Akmatidas of Sparta won the pentathlon at Olympia *akoniti* in 500 BC and Theogenes of Thasos won the crown three times *akoniti* at the Pythia. When Apollonios who was late for the month's training at Elis was found guilty of lying in saying that contrary winds held him up, his opponent, Herakleides, was awarded the crown *akoniti*.<sup>40</sup>

At Olympia, however, competitors could not withdraw (without a fine) *once* the festival had started, and the small number of competitors in some Olympic events must be due to the fact that many would-be contestants, having 'sized-up' the competition and aware of the reputation of some of the competitors, decided during the training period to withdraw. The increasing number of festivals,

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

from the hellenistic into the Roman period, involving contests with prizes attracting athletes from throughout the Greek world, would have made it all the more clear just who the best athletes were.

The contests at Olympia were under the jurisdiction of the hellanodikai, who had their own stoa at Elis, where they lived for ten months and were instructed by the nomophylarchoi, the guardians of the law, about their duties at the contests.<sup>41</sup> Epigraphic evidence, however, indicates that before becoming known as hellanodikai the judges were known as diaitateres (a term which Pausanias does not use).<sup>42</sup> Several fragments of inscriptions indicate that there were various written laws about aspects of the competitions: a rule about wrestling dated to the late sixth century BC, and another which also seems to be about wrestling.<sup>43</sup> These rules were probably written down as part of the overall phenomenon of codifying laws in the seventh and sixth centuries.

The number of judges changed in the course of time: from one to ten eventually.<sup>44</sup> The change in name was probably a reflection of the panhellenic character which the festival had already obtained by this time, and the increased number of judges was due to an increase in competitors and events. Initially, the Eleians, including the hellanodikai themselves, could take part in events. The Egyptians are said by Herodotos to have criticised the fact that at the Olympic contests any Eleian could compete. After Troilos, a hellanodikes, won two chariot victories in 372 BC, the Eleians decreed that hellanodikai could no longer enter contests.<sup>45</sup>

The Spartans were fond of entering chariot teams at the Olympic contests, but of the three 'combative' events they generally entered only the wrestling (pankration and boxing being the other two). Boxing and the pankration involved direct surrender to the opponent, either by submission or concussion, or occasionally even death, while wrestling was decided when one of the wrestlers had thrown his opponent three times (a throw was when the opponent's knees touched the ground). In wrestling defeat did not have to be conceded; this applied also to events such as running.<sup>46</sup> The Spartans did not want to have to *concede* defeat to an opponent.

Between the great altar of Zeus and the stadium the Echo Colonnade created a boundary between the cult centre and the agonistic area, which meant that the stadium could not be seen from the sanctuary area. It has been suggested that this meant that the

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

contests were secular, divorced from the context of the religious sanctuary. But as Mallwitz notes, the previous stadiums were not blocked off from the Altis area; when the present stadium was built in c. 340, with an embankment, it was moved 75 metres east, away from the Altis, and the Echo Colonnade dates to a later period than this stadium.<sup>47</sup> Cult centre and agonistic area were not always separate, and in the classical period were clearly associated. At Olympia religious concerns always dominated.

#### THE PYTHIAN FESTIVAL

After Olympia, Delphi was the second great panhellenic centre. In addition to its oracular function, Delphi was also the host of a penteteric festival, the Pythia, attracting pilgrims as athletes, musicians and spectators from throughout the Greek world. There were both musical and athletic contests at the site, including chariot-racing, but music always seems to have been the most important competition. The Pythian festival was probably originally held before the First Sacred War as a festival held every eight years,<sup>48</sup> but after 586 the Pythian festival was instead celebrated every four years.<sup>49</sup> At the first celebration, in 586, held after the First Sacred War the Amphictyons celebrated the victory with a sacrifice, and for the first time gave monetary awards for athletic contests modelled on those at Olympia, paid for from the proceeds of the spoils (that is, it was a prize contest – *chrematites agon* – as opposed to a crown contest).<sup>50</sup> This generosity on the part of the authorities did not extend to the following celebration of 582, possibly because the spoils had been exhausted, or in imitation of Olympia, where wreaths and not prizes were awarded to the victor; the contests became once again *stephanitai agones*.<sup>51</sup> The Pythian festival commenced on the seventh day of the month Boukatios, the second month of summer (in August or early September), and was organised by the Delphic Amphictyony, and took place in the third year of the Olympiad.<sup>52</sup>

Pausanias states that the oldest competition at Delphi, and the first for which prizes were awarded, was for the singing of a hymn to the accompaniment of the lyre in honour of Apollo. This clearly indicates the religious origins of the festival. Various additions were made to the repertoire of the musical contests at Delphi, and the dithyrambic competition, for both tragedy and comedy, was probably added in the fourth century.<sup>53</sup> From the third century

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

onwards the *technitai* of Dionysos, groups of professional actors and musicians, participated in festivals throughout Greece. The Athenian *technitai* were given various privileges by the Delphic Amphictyony in order to ensure that they participated in the Pythian festival,<sup>54</sup> presumably because they were considered to be amongst the best performers.

The sporting contests were similar to those at Olympia, and as at Olympia various contests were added over time. The chariot-race was instituted in 582, with Kleisthenes, tyrant of Sikyon, the victor. Delphi also hosted competitions of an artistic nature: painters vied to be chosen as the best in their field, but the nature of the competition is unclear. As most painting was done on walls, it seems most likely that the artists had to paint under supervised conditions. Portraits could, however, be executed on moveable objects, such as shields, but it was probably not permissible to enter paintings already executed, as this would allow for the possibility of fraud.<sup>55</sup>

#### THE ISTHMIAN FESTIVAL

The Isthmian festival was held at the Isthmus of Corinth and organised by Corinth, under the patronage of the god Poseidon, in the first and third years of the Olympic cycle, in spring (April/May).<sup>56</sup> Poseidon was the patron deity, but the festival was clearly funerary in its origins, with the contests, as at Nemea, originating in honour of a dead child, in this case Melicertes.<sup>57</sup> The festival commenced with a sacrifice to Poseidon at dawn, and it was customary for the contests to begin with a ritual chant.<sup>58</sup>

A second foundation myth is clearly Athenian in origin, with Theseus claiming all land north of the Isthmus as Ionian and establishing the festival. This represents an Athenian claim to the Megarid, probably dating to 460 when Megara became Athens' ally and was garrisoned by Athens. The Theseus myth sought to justify the control of Megara and also laid claim to the nearest panhellenic festival, in which many Athenians competed (due to proximity), and successfully.<sup>59</sup> This claim to Megara fitted in neatly with Theseus' traditional exploits in the area, and with his rising prominence in the 470s and his elevation to the status of state hero when Kimon brought his bones back to Athens.<sup>60</sup>

The traditional date for the founding of the Isthmian festival was 582 or 580, which places the festival in the same context as

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the establishment of the penteteric Pythia in 582, and the Nemean festival in 573. The archaic temple itself dates to well before 582/80, indicating religious activity before the establishment of contests.<sup>61</sup>

The Isthmian festival was unusual in that it was held in the vicinity of a powerful state and organised by it. Moreover, the fact that the site is centrally located and astride the land route from the Peloponnese to the rest of mainland Greece made it particularly accessible to visitors, which might mean that it attracted even more visitors than Olympia. Livy, in describing the proclamation of Greece's 'liberty' in 196 BC by Flamininus comments that the Isthmian festival was always attended by crowds, the Greeks being fond of contests, but also because, with two seas so close, Corinth was a market-place for Greece and Asia.<sup>62</sup>

Although the Isthmian contests were modelled on the Olympian, there were intermediate age contests, as at Nemea, by the fifth century BC: between the categories of men and boys was placed a youths' age category. There were contests of the usual type, including chariot-racing, appropriate for Poseidon in whose honour the contests were celebrated, athletic and musical contests. The first musical victories are recorded in the third century BC, with Nikokles of Taras (Tarentum in Italy) winning six victories, but this need not mean that they did not exist earlier, and Pliny records a painting competition (as at Delphi). One woman, Aristomache of Erythrai, was recorded by Polemon (writing in the early second century BC) to have been twice victorious in the contest in epic verse at the Isthmia.<sup>63</sup>

#### THE NEMEAN FESTIVAL

Like the Olympic festival, the Nemean festival was celebrated in honour of Zeus, and the first Nemea was held in 573, which suggests a deliberate attempt to emulate the by then well-established Olympic festival.<sup>64</sup> The nearby town of Kleonai had control of the site and festival, but the city was clearly in a close subordinate relationship to Argos, and conduct of the festival was handed over to Argos at some time preceding the destruction of the Nemean sanctuary at the close of the fifth century; the festival returned to Kleonai in the closing decades of the fourth century but was soon back at Argos. At Nemea, representations of the infant, Opheltes, have been unearthed; the Nemean festival is a funerary cult in his honour,<sup>65</sup> and the Nemean hellanodikai wore

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

black robes because of the funerary associations of the festival's origins.<sup>66</sup> A rival myth, almost certainly later in date, has Herakles founding the Nemea after slaying the Nemean lion. The Nemea was held biennially, in the second and fourth years of the Olympiad, in late July or early August. The length of the festival is unknown, but the list of events indicates that the programme extended over at least several days.<sup>67</sup> There were gymnastic, equestrian and musical events, and a competition between heralds. There were three categories in the gymnastic events: boys, youths and men.

Many graffiti were inscribed on the lower two courses of the fourth-century tunnel leading into the stadium, presumably by the athletes as they waited to enter the stadium. The name 'Telestas' is written on the first block on the right at the very entrance of the tunnel. A Telestas won the boy's boxing at Olympia, possibly in 340 BC, and the two are usually connected. Another graffito is simply: 'I win.'<sup>68</sup> Sometimes a name is followed by the word 'kalos', beautiful, presumably written by an admirer. The name Akrotatos appears in the tunnel twice: once by itself, and again a metre and a half away, this time with the adjective kalos: 'Akrotatos the beautiful', which is followed in a different hand by 'to the one who wrote it'. The name Akrotatos is rare; two examples are known from Sparta, the handsome young king of 265–252, and his grandfather (the latter died in 309 before his own father and therefore did not become king).<sup>69</sup> The Akrotatos of the graffiti is sometimes identified with the Spartan king of that name, but it could also be his grandfather; most likely, it is someone else entirely. The scene in the tunnel is easily imagined: athletes, waiting for their turn in the stadium, scratching their names on the walls, and perhaps leaving their clothes and any other equipment they may have brought with them; trainers may have been present with words of advice and encouragement.

#### THE ARGIVE HERAIA

The sanctuary of Hera in Argos attracted worshippers from all over Argos, and while the priest there told Kleomenes that it was 'not holy' for *xenoi*, strangers, to sacrifice there, this may have been purely because Argos and Sparta were enemies. Non-Argive participation at the Heraia, Hera's festival, is indicated by the *theorodokos* at Corinth who hosted the Argives who announced the festivals of both the Nemea and the Argive Heraia. This indi-

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

cates that the Corinthians sent representatives to the Heraia, as other states, particularly Peloponnesian ones, presumably did. Victors from Rhodes and Athens are also attested for the contests at the Heraia.<sup>70</sup>

#### PRIZES AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

At the *stephanitai agones* (crown contests) the 'prize' for the victor was a crown in the form of a wreath from a tree or plant, usually having a cultic association with the festival concerned. The wreaths were of various kinds: wild olive (Olympia), bay (Delphi), pine (or celery, depending on the period, for the Isthmia), or celery (Nemea).<sup>71</sup> Olive wreaths were not given as prizes at the Olympic festival until the seventh Olympiad (752),<sup>72</sup> and presumably before then the prizes awarded were tripods and similar articles. The date is traditional and need not be accepted, but clearly there was a belief that at some stage there were material prizes for the Olympics before the introduction of wreaths. The cutting of the Olympic wreath was in itself a ritual: a boy with both parents living cut the olive wreath with a golden sickle from an olive tree.<sup>73</sup> Pausanias states that the wreaths were cut from the wild olive tree in the Altis, known as the 'Beautiful Crown'. The Pythian wreath was also picked by a boy with living parents at Tempe.<sup>74</sup> At most contests a wreath of palm would also be given to the victor, and at all games a palm branch was placed in the right hand of the successful athlete; victors might be pelted with roses, rose-campion, apples and pomegranates.<sup>75</sup>

Before the award of the crown by the judges, the initial sign of victory was the crowning of the athlete with a fillet (ribbon) or fillets. Victory statues sometimes show the athlete wearing a fillet.<sup>76</sup> The athlete might bind the fillet on his head personally,<sup>77</sup> and statue heads with the fillet survive.<sup>78</sup> On one Panathenaic amphora, Nike holds a white fillet in outstretched arms as two wrestlers compete.<sup>79</sup> In the case of chariot-racing, the owner might crown the driver with a fillet, as Lichas the Spartan did in 420. The use of the fillet does not appear to have lasted into the Roman period and may have fallen into disuse earlier. Both Philostratos and Pausanias misunderstood the significance of the fillet on the statue of Milon of Kroton: Philostratos thought it indicated that Milon was a priest of Hera, Pausanias that Milon would bind a cord around his forehead, hold his breath and fill the veins on his head

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

with blood in order that the cord would break, an implausible explanation.<sup>80</sup> The donning of the fillet was the act of the victor or an associate, but the hellanodikai at Olympia were responsible for the official wreath, though they did not necessarily put the wreath on the victor's head.

Binding the fillet on the victorious athlete is shown on Attic vases. For example, on an Attic red-figure hydria of c. 500 BC, a youth is depicted with red ribbons on his left leg and arm, with a wreath around his neck, and he is holding in his left hand a sprig of leaves; a bearded figure, interpreted as the trainer, umpire or youth's lover, is in the process of tying another red ribbon around the youth's head.<sup>81</sup> The placing of the wreath around the neck was part of the ceremony of the phyllobolia, in which the victor was adorned with sprigs of leaves by the crowd for the victory. The athletes on vases sometimes wear fillets, and in addition carry these sprigs and sometimes a wreath of leaves (this was distinct from crowning the victor on the head with the wreath which was the official prize).<sup>82</sup> One panathenaic amphora depicts what seems to be a proclamation of victory: a boy on horseback is followed by a boy carrying a wreath in his left hand and balancing a large tripod on his head, which he is supporting with the right hand. A robed figure in front has an inscription cascading vertically from his mouth: 'proclaiming the horse victory'.<sup>83</sup>

In addition to the victory fillet and the phyllobolia, there was the official prize wreath. Apollonios, disqualified from the boxing at Olympia for arriving too late, attacked Herakleides, who would have been his opponent; Herakleides had already put the wild olive on his own head, that is, he crowned himself. In another case, Arrachion was crowned by the hellanodikai just as he was dying, still in the grip of his opponent in the pankration. Similarly, a victor's inscription reads: 'those who direct straight the Olympic festival with (their) laws [crown]ed (me)'.<sup>84</sup> Statues of Olympic victors sometimes depicted the olive crown on the head.<sup>85</sup>

Monetary and material prizes were often awarded at non-panhellenic contests. The contestants at Patroklos' funeral games were awarded prizes, and this Homeric tradition continued, with the 'crown contests' providing an exception to the rule. Prizes came in a variety of forms, and not all were monetary. At the Panathenaia, for example, prizes included vases of olive oil. In praising an Argive victor, Theaios, who won the wrestling at the Nemea, Pindar sings too of his victories in the Panathenaia:



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

At the sacred rites of the Athenians, twice sweet voices celebrated him in the prelude of a triumphal ode, and in fired clay the fruit of the olive in richly glazed vases came to the glorious men of Hera [the Argives].<sup>86</sup>

Pindar also records the prizes which Theaios' ancestors won at contests: silver wine cups from Sikyon; woollen cloaks from Pellana; and bronzes from the festivals at Kleitor, Tegea, the Achaean cities and the Lykaion. Elsewhere, Pindar mentions silver wine cups from Marathon (at the Herakleia) won by Epharmostos, also winner in the wrestling at Olympia in 468. The league of five Dorian cities in Asia Minor awarded bronze tripods to victors in the contests held at its cult centre at the Triopion, which, however, victors were expected to dedicate in the temple at the site. Damotimos of Troizen won a tripod at the footrace at Thebes; Argos (for the Heraia) gave out shields. 'Erga', perhaps 'works of art' or woven goods, like the woollen cloaks from Pellana, were given as prizes in Arcadia and at Thebes. A bronze hydria was awarded at Phthia, while the cities of Ionia gave money as prizes.

#### PANHELLENISM AND PROFESSIONALISM

The fact that the victors at Olympia received only a wreath has been partially responsible for the modern myth of amateurism at the ancient Olympics – that the athletes competed only for honour and not for material reward. While it cannot be denied that the honour and prestige were important, Olympic athletes often received material rewards for victory when they returned to their city.

At Athens, victors in the Olympic, Pythian, Isthmian or Nemean contests were granted *sitesis* (dining privileges) in the *prytaneion* for life, sharing this privilege with the descendants of the tyrannicides, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, who assassinated Hipparchos in 514.<sup>87</sup> Socrates argued at his trial for impiety that he should be granted *sitesis* in the *prytaneion*, as being more worthy of this than victors in equestrian events at Olympia.<sup>88</sup> Dining rights in the *prytaneion* for victors were also a privilege on Keos and Paros.<sup>89</sup> Solon is said in 594 to have reduced the monetary reward paid to Athenians who had been victorious at the Olympics to 500 drachmas, and set 100 drachmas as the prize for victors at the Isthmian festival (proximity to Athens may have

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

meant that there was more Athenian involvement in this festival than the Nemea or Pythia). There was no currency in Athens in Solon's time, and the Isthmian festival was not organised as a panhellenic event until 582 or 580, so like the many laws attributed to Solon, this one is almost certainly anachronistic.<sup>90</sup> Ephesos also provided a monetary reward for winning a crown.<sup>91</sup> Xenophanes of Kolophon in the sixth century complained about the various honours bestowed upon a victor at Olympia, either in running, the pentathlon, wrestling, 'painful' boxing, the 'terrible' pankration, or in a victory with horses: such a victor 'would win a conspicuous seat of honour at the games, and would get maintenance out of the public stores from the city, as well as a gift for him to put by as treasure'. But for Xenophanes, his own wisdom 'is better than the strength of men or of horses'.<sup>92</sup> The cities of the victorious would provide what seem to be very generous prizes. On the other hand, it seems that states did little apart from these post-victory rewards to encourage specific athletes to train and compete: the state's assistance was limited to rewarding the successful. A sixth-century bronze tablet discovered at Sybaris in southern Italy records a dedication to the goddess Athena by an athlete, Kleombrotos, victorious at Olympia, of a tenth of his prize, presumably awarded by his city.<sup>93</sup>

Jars of olive oil were the prizes given for some of the events at the Panathenaia, but several of the Panathenaic competitions had monetary awards. The Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* states that there were monetary prizes for musical contests, shields for the contest in manliness (the euandria), and olive oil for athletics and the horse-race.<sup>94</sup> Prizes were given for first to fifth place in the men's contest for singing to the accompaniment of one's own kithara: first prize was a gold crown worth 1,000 drachmas, and 500 silver drachmas, second, 1,200 drachmas, third, 600 drachmas, fourth, 400 drachmas, and fifth, 300 drachmas. Flute and kithara players also received monetary awards. Place-winners in athletic and equestrian events received vases of oil. First prize in the youths' wrestling was forty vases of oil, with a second prize of eight. Victory in the youths' stadion brought sixty vases of oil.<sup>95</sup> The kithara contest was obviously the most prestigious, with the greatest amount of prize-money. What would a victor do with these vases? Alkibiades, at least, kept his, while other victors sold them, took them home, or dedicated one, or possibly more, of them.<sup>96</sup> While there were prizes for second and third place and

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

even fourth and fifth in some Panathenaic contests, this was not the case for all festivals, and at the *stephanitai agones* only the first-place winner was crowned with a wreath.

Financial rewards, and to a lesser degree, the *sitesis* offered in the *prytaneion*, were no doubt a powerful incentive for competitors.<sup>97</sup> Public renown came with victory: the victor received a welcome home in the form of a civic reception, perhaps even being honoured by the dismantling of a section of the city walls in order to make a triumphant entry.<sup>98</sup> Such civic receptions for victors, even without the demolition of the walls, were known as *iselastic entries*. Exainetos of Akragas, who won the stadion at Olympia in 412 BC, was conducted into his city by a procession consisting of 300 chariots, each of which was drawn by two white horses. His pilgrimage to Olympia was twice rewarded: there was the honour gained at Olympia, and the glory which this brought to him at home.<sup>99</sup> But it was not the athlete alone who gained prestige, and sources confirm that the crowned athlete bestowed kudos on the city.<sup>100</sup> In fact, the victor was thought to crown his city with his wreath or wreaths won in the *stephanitai agones* in honour of the gods.<sup>101</sup>

The competitor could also use his athletic fame as an aid to gaining political power. Despite the fact that Xenophanes writes that a city will not enjoy better government because someone has won a victory, and that the joy of the city is short-lived when an athlete is victorious at Olympia,<sup>102</sup> victorious athletes and their cities took a different attitude. Individuals could use athletic victories, along with other factors, to enhance their political status.<sup>103</sup>

Kylon in the seventh century is the best example from Athens. A victor at Olympia and son-in-law of Theagenes, tyrant of Megara, he attempted to become tyrant of Athens with the help of his father-in-law and his friends. An oracle at Delphi prompted him to seize the acropolis and attempt to set up a tyranny during the 'greatest festival of Zeus', which he took to mean the Olympic festival, particularly as he was an Olympic victor. The Athenians, however, celebrated a festival known as the *Diasia*, which was called 'the greatest festival of Zeus the Protector', and Thucydides implies that this was the festival which the oracle meant.<sup>104</sup> The Athenians besieged Kylon on the acropolis; he and his brother escaped but their supporters were put to death.

Kimon, in exile from Athens, was victorious in the Olympic four-horse chariot-race in 536 and again in 532, at which Olympics

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

he conceded the victory to Peisistratos as tyrant of Athens, and was allowed to return to Athens; he won a third victory in 528. His four mares which had also been three times victorious were buried opposite his grave.<sup>105</sup> When in the debate about the Sicilian expedition Nikias attacked Alkibiades' reputation, Alkibiades mentioned his own Olympic victory, and pointed out that when the Greeks thought that Athens was finished because of the war, they had to change their minds and came to consider Athens to be greater than it really was because of his success at Olympia (in 416). On that occasion, he had entered seven chariots – more than any individual had previously – and won first, second and fourth places.<sup>106</sup>

For the Spartan athletes who had made the pilgrimage to the *stephanitai* agones and been victorious, there was the privilege, writes Plutarch, of fighting near their kings when the Spartans went to war.<sup>107</sup> For Plutarch, the reason for this was that athletic training was good practice for warfare. However, while in the *Moralia* he writes that there is a place in the fighting by the king for victors in the crown contests, in the *Life of Lykourgos* he uses the singular: 'the king went against the enemy having with him one who had been victorious in a crown contest'. Kurke has argued that the idea that such a victor was present with the king because of athletic prowess will not stand if there is only one victor present, and argues instead that the victor has talismanic force, the potency of a win translating into the 'magical' potency of one individual in battle.<sup>108</sup> However, while the *Lykourgos* can be emended to give *victors* rather than a *victor*, in the *Lykourgos* Plutarch need not necessarily be excluding the idea of several victors, as he immediately goes on to tell the story of a Spartan wrestler who refused a huge bribe at the Olympic festival because if victorious he would fight in front of the king. Clearly, he could not be assured of this unless every Spartan victor at crown contests had this honour.

Many of those chosen as military commanders or as *oikistai* (founders of colonies) are known to have won victories at festivals. The choice of victors for these positions must frequently have been a consequence of belonging to an elite which took part in equestrian activities and exercised in the gymnasium, and from which leaders would be chosen (however, some athletes clearly did not come from the upper socio-economic stratum). Moreover, their athletic ability may have been taken as reflecting ability in other

areas, rather than, as Kurke argues, reflecting a belief in the talismanic power of such individuals.

Chionis of Sparta, thrice victorious at Olympia, may have helped to found Cyrene with Battos.<sup>109</sup> Phrynon, an Olympic victor in 636 in the pankration, led the Athenian settlement to Sigeion (on the southern side of the Hellespont) towards the end of the seventh century, and was killed by Pittakos of Mytilene, which opposed Athenian interests there; Phrynon also founded Elaios on the opposite side of the strait on the Chersonese.<sup>110</sup> Miltiades, son of Kypselos, victor in the Olympic chariot-race, was sought out by the Dolonkoi on the advice of the Delphic oracle, to be their oikist in the Chersonese, where he became tyrant.<sup>111</sup> Another possibility as athlete-cum-oikist is Leon, one of the three oikistai of Herakleia in Trachis founded in 426 by Sparta. A Leon won a chariot victory at Olympia, possibly in 428, and may have been the oikist Leon.<sup>112</sup>

In addition, victors, like Phrynon, could be military commanders. Milon of Kroton, six times Olympic victor, defeated Sybaris in the sixth century. He went into battle as commander against the Sybarites wearing his six Olympic crowns and dressed as Herakles; he was instrumental in winning the battle for Kroton. Kurke suggests this is a case of talismanic power, but perhaps a more plausible explanation for the victory was his strength and courage, which Diodoros comments upon. When the Ionian forces were retreating from Sardis and the Persians came upon them at Ephesos, amongst those killed was Eualkides, commander of the Eretrians, who had won at crown contests and had been 'much praised' by Simonides. Phayllos of Kroton, the only western Greek to fight against the Persians, had been victorious three times at the Pythia.<sup>113</sup>

Athletes might also be heroized: Theogenes of Thasos who won 1,400 victories was venerated after his death as a hero, and was said to be a son of Herakles, and his cult spread widely. Philippos of Kroton, an Olympian victor in 520 and the 'most beautiful man' of his time, had a heroon (hero shrine) at Segesta and was worshipped posthumously, but Herodotos emphasises that his good looks were primarily responsible for the heroization. Euthymos of Lokri in Italy, who won Olympic boxing victories in 484, 476 and 472, was sacrificed to in his own lifetime, and was thought to be the son of a local river god.<sup>114</sup>

But there is another issue which needs to be raised, and that is whether athletes had a religious motivation if they competed for

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

monetary prizes. Gardiner and Harris held that originally Greek athletic contests were amateur in nature, and that they 'degenerated' from the fourth century onwards as money came into the 'game' and a professional class of athletes arose. But the evidence is that there were material prizes offered for victories in the fifth century, and these rewards would not have been offered if they were not an inducement to participate.

Athletes who travelled the circuit of contests were interested in the monetary and material rewards but were nevertheless, particularly in classical times, also aware that they were participating in a religious festival. Even in those contests that rewarded victors only with wreaths, such as Olympia, competitors were clearly motivated by the desire for honour for themselves and to 'crown' their cities, as well as by the material rewards that awaited them there.

If athletes came wholly or mainly from the elite, for whom the prizes were not a significant concern in that prizes did not need to make a living from them, then the fact that they were awarded at many festival contests becomes less important. Many scholars have stressed that athletic contests were the preserve of the aristocratic elite, which did not primarily compete for the prizes. This is true to a large extent, but the social status of some athletes is a matter of debate. Young has argued that the monetary prizes available at local contests would have given a poor but talented athlete the resources to continue his career, and that several festivals had a boys' category which meant that a career could be launched while a boy.<sup>115</sup> Well-known athletes who did not come from elite backgrounds included Polymnestor of Miletos, described as a 'goatherd' who competed successfully as a boy at Olympia; Amesinas, a 'cowherd'; Glaukos of Karystos (Euboia, c. 520), a farmer's son and victor in boxing at Olympia; as well as an anonymous fish-porter.<sup>116</sup> Koroibos of Elis, the earliest known victor at Olympia, in 776, is usually described as a 'cook' by modern scholars, translating 'mageiros' as the 'butcher' at sacrifices, but this might also be a ritual title for a priest from the elite.<sup>117</sup>

Moreover, the socio-economic background of many athletes is not known, and is often described as 'elite' simply on the premise that athletes came from 'elite' backgrounds. Theogenes, who had an athletic career spanning twenty-two years, including boxing (480) and pankration (476) at Olympia, is usually described as an aristocrat, but as several scholars have argued there is no evidence

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

for this at all. Similarly, Milon of Kroton is assumed to have been an aristocrat but the evidence certainly does not suggest this.<sup>118</sup>

Athletes could therefore originate in the lower socio-economic group, and the career of Theogenes, with its numerous victories, suggests a peripatetic career which must have been 'professional' in nature: he almost certainly made his living from athletics (which would then suggest that he did not come from the aristocracy).<sup>119</sup> On the other hand, many athletes were from the higher socio-economic category, with the leisure and resources to participate, such as Kylon, Kimon and Alkibiades. And some events, such as chariot-racing, which required large amounts of money, would always have been the preserve of the wealthy. In fact, Alkibiades' son states, in a speech written by Isocrates, that Alkibiades entered chariots in the Olympic event in 416 rather than one of the athletic events because he was aware that some of the athletes were of lowly birth, came from small cities and were of low education.<sup>120</sup> In the classical period and beyond there must have been 'professional' athletes who went to many festivals in order to earn a living, but the elite continued to provide many competitors, who had the time and wealth to train, and for whom exercise in the gymnasium and palaestra was a part of their lifestyle. They did not need the material rewards, but great prestige came as a result of these victories, precisely because they were won at important festivals.

#### CONCLUSION

Clearly the festivals and accompanying contests were religious events, and it is the modern Olympic games with their purely secular framework which are perhaps responsible for a view that the ancient Olympics and other panhellenic festivals involving contests were not pilgrimages. It is more difficult to ascertain the religious motives of the participants. Those who competed at the contests as a means of making a living cannot easily fall into the category of pilgrims. What can be said is that those who competed for kudos and material reward, but who thanked the gods for victory – and presumably this was the majority of competitors – were in this sense pilgrims, individuals involved in a religious activity away from their home-state. The cult framework of all the panhellenic festivals is undeniable: they were held in honour of the gods, there were sacrifices and processions, and the contests were a prominent part of the festivals. The fruits of victory

#### CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

were often dedicated to the gods, as will be seen in chapter 5 (p. 133) and chapter 6 (pp. 173–76), and victory was so important that athletes could pray for it – or death.



## 5

# PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

There were a number of pilgrimages in the Greek world which were restricted to people of particular ethnic groups, and generally these festivals were of great antiquity. These religious celebrations were open only to Greeks of a specific ethnos ('race'; plural: ethne): for example, the Ionians celebrated the Delia, the Panionia, and in the fifth century, the Great Panathenaia at Athens. The Dorians, too, had at least one pilgrimage site in Asia Minor which, however, only involved five or six cities, while the Boeotians gathered every sixty years in order to celebrate a festival which clearly had, in the pre-classical period, a human sacrifice as its central rite. The pilgrimages which centred on the ethnos stressed not the polis or panhellenism but a group midway between the two, the racial group, such as the ethnos of the Dorians or the ethnos of the Ionians. By their nature, such ethnic festivals did not permit the participation of pilgrims from outside of the ethnic group, and this parallels the prohibitions on certain ethnic groups (Dorians and Aetolians) at particular sanctuaries which will be examined in chapter 6.

## DELOS AND THE IONIANS

Delos was the main religious centre of the Ionian ethnos, and though Ionians in Asia Minor had a meeting place at the Panionion where they would gather for political and religious purposes, and the Athenians in the fifth century decreed that their Ionian allies were to participate in the Great Panathenaia at Athens, it was to Delos that the Ionians primarily went to worship together. The Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* makes clear Delos' primacy, and Apollo, according to myth, was born on this island.<sup>1</sup>

#### PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

Thucydides states that in the winter of 426/5 the Athenians carried out a purification of Delos, 'no doubt because of some oracle'. Peisistratos had previously carried out a partial purification of the island.<sup>2</sup> Why the Athenians carried out the purification in 426/5 is unknown, but it is possible that during the Peloponnesian War the Athenians sought to promote a festival which, if not panhellenic, at least was not in enemy hands; Delphi may have been thought to be under Peloponnesian influence.<sup>3</sup> The Delia was a Panionian religious celebration exclusive of the members of the Peloponnesian alliance and of the Dorian ethnoses. Nevertheless, throughout the war, the Athenians continued their participation in festivals hosted by other states, such as the Isthmia which their enemy, Corinth, presided over. However, the exclusion of non-Ionians, and the participation of the members of the empire in the Delia, must have been at least partially intended to strengthen ties between the head of the empire and the allies. The insistence upon the participation of the members of the Athenian empire in the Great Panathenaia and City Dionysia at Athens will no doubt have been for a similar motive.

At Delos, the Athenians instituted a penteteric (four-yearly) festival which was based upon an older festival; the new festival was known as the Apollonia or Delia.<sup>4</sup> Thucydides refers to this festival as having existed in the distant past, stating that there was once a great gathering at Delos of the Ionians and neighbouring islanders, with contests in athletics, poetry and music. Each participating city would furnish a chorus which would compete in song and dance; there were also boxing contests. However, the contests and the majority of the ceremonies were later discontinued, probably because of 'disasters',<sup>5</sup> though the islanders and the Athenians are mentioned by Thucydides as continuing to send choruses. The fact that the Ionians of Asia Minor are not mentioned as doing so has been taken as an indication that the latter were not participating at this time, and could indicate that the domination by the Lydians and subsequently by the Persians of the Asia Minor seaboard put an end to participation in the festival by the Ionians of this area.<sup>6</sup> The full programme lapsed until 426, when the Athenians revived the celebration in its ancient form, and in addition added a new event, horse-racing.<sup>7</sup> The main item of the re-established festival was a choral competition, with choruses singing in honour of the god; there were also athletic contests.<sup>8</sup> Prizes were offered to the victorious.<sup>9</sup>

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

Thucydides quotes the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* in support of his statement regarding the original celebration and states that the evidence of 'Homer' attests to a great gathering of Ionians at Delos. This indicates that Delos had been a pilgrimage site from at least the date of the composition of this *Homeric Hymn*:

Chiefly, O Phoibos [Apollo], your heart found delight in the  
island of Delos.  
There, with their long robes trailing, Ionians gather together,  
Treading your sacred road, with their wives and children  
about them,  
There they give you pleasure with boxing and dancing, and  
singing,  
Calling aloud on your name, as they set in order the  
contests.<sup>10</sup>

There is also the evidence from the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus in flattering Nausikaa compares her beauty to that of a 'fresh young palm tree' shooting up by the altar of Apollo at Delos, which he says he had seen when he was there, with an army at his back.<sup>11</sup> Clearly he was *en route* to Troy; nevertheless, the reference to Delos as a religious centre, together with the evidence of the *Homeric Hymn*, indicates that Delos was one of the oldest pilgrimage sites in the Greek world, dating back to at least the eighth century. Myth also records that Theseus, returning home to Athens from Crete, celebrated contests in honour of Apollo on Delos, crowning the victors with palm, and that the use of palm as a victor's token at festivals stemmed from this occasion.<sup>12</sup>

Thucydides writes of a penteteric festival, but the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* distinguishes between two different types of festival on Delos: the penteteric festival, which was administered by a board of ten officials in Athens, elected by lot, which had charge of all the penteteric festivals except the Panathenaic, and a second, six-yearly festival.<sup>13</sup> In the fourth century, the eponymous archon appointed the choregoi for Delos and an architheoros for the ship, a triakonter, that carried the youths of the choruses. This triakonter was supposed to be the one actually used by Theseus, refurbished from year to year with new planks.<sup>14</sup>

Further information is provided by Plutarch in his life of Nikias, who acted as the Athenian architheoros to Delos in the latter part of the fifth century, conducting the Athenian theoria to the island in an unusually splendid manner. Plutarch's account of Nikias'

theoria gives detailed information about Athenian involvement in a specific celebration of the festival, and as such the account is unique, for there is no comparable record of an individual celebration of a festival in a particular year.<sup>15</sup>

Nikias undertook the costs of conducting the theoria as a liturgy, as other wealthy individuals would have done. Fourth-century financial accounts, however, suggest that subsidies might be made by the polis; clearly not all liturgists were as wealthy as Nikias.<sup>16</sup> In 375/4 financial payments were made by the Delian Amphictyony to architheoroi who were probably Athenian, and a grant of 7,000 drachmas to an Athenian trierarch for conveying the theoroi and the choruses.

Plutarch records that the delegations from the cities which sent choruses to Delos for the celebration sailed up to the island in no fixed order, and that a crowd met the ships and told the choruses to start singing, even while they were disembarking, putting on their wreaths and changing into festive dress. This implies that they may not have been wreathed as they travelled on the ship, but Plutarch's statement may perhaps refer to their donning new wreaths upon their arrival and disembarkation. Nikias, when he led the Athenian theoria, landed first on nearby Rheneia, with his chorus, sacrificial victims and other equipment. He bridged Rheneia and Delos with boats, decorated with gold, coloured fabrics, wreaths and screens. At dawn the richly dressed chorus went in procession over the bridge, singing as it went.<sup>17</sup> Nikias could afford such lavish expenditure, and as a further gesture bought a piece of land on Delos for 10,000 drachmas and dedicated it to the gods: the proceeds were to go towards sacrifices, at which the Delians were to ask for blessings from the gods for Nikias. He erected a bronze palm-tree to Apollo, which was, however, later blown down by the wind, overturning in its fall the great statue erected by the Naxians.<sup>18</sup>

Other Athenian theoriai presumably did not match Nikias' standard of expenditure, and the reason why it is recorded is that it was unusual. Moreover, Plutarch discusses the theoria in the context of Nikias' liberality in choregic and gymnastic liturgies, since Nikias throughout his career attempted to win political popularity in Athens by these means.<sup>19</sup> The Athenian pilgrimage to Delos was, therefore, manipulated by Nikias for his own political advantage. The extent of popular participation, as opposed to the official sending of theoriai, for the history of the festival from the fifth

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

century and later, is unknown, but the site was an important one and the participation of many Ionian states and the number of the choruses as mentioned by Plutarch implies that the festival was a major one which presumably attracted pilgrims, other than those on official missions, as competitors and spectators. Many Delians made a living from the pilgrims who visited Delos, indicating the number of worshippers who went there.<sup>20</sup> No inscriptions attest to the celebration of the festival after 314, and it seems that Athenian loss of control of the island led to the festival's abandonment or modification. In 166, however, the Athenians regained control of the island and reinstituted the festival, with the programme including athletic and equestrian events.<sup>21</sup>

#### THE HYPERBOREAN GIFTS

According to Herodotos, the (mythical) Hyperboreans were said to send first-fruits (*aparchai*) to Delos; they did not bring the offerings to Delos themselves, but rather these were passed by the Hyperboreans into Scythia and then handed on by various peoples until the offerings were conveyed to the Adriatic, then to Dodona, on to Euboia, and passed from town to town to Karystos in the south of the island. The Karystians took them to Tenos, and the people of Tenos to Delos. Pausanias records an Athenian version that the offerings arrived at the port of Prasiai in Attica from Sinope on the Black Sea, and that the Athenians conveyed them to Delos. Herodotos and Callimachus, who gives a slightly different route, do not mention the Athenians, so Pausanias might be reflecting a change of route at a later period. Who these Hyperboreans were is impossible to say, but it has been suggested that they may have been a distant Greek community near Scythia. That they sent gifts is recorded in inscribed accounts on Delos.<sup>22</sup>

#### THE PANIONION

In addition to the festival at Delos, the Ionians of Asia Minor had their own ethnic celebration which centred around the association known as the *koinon* (league) of the Ionians,<sup>23</sup> which seems to have had an early origin, a date between 900–700 being suggested for its foundation.<sup>24</sup> The deciding factor in determining this has to be the dating of the Ionian migration, and the consequent development of an Ionian consciousness amongst the member cities of the

#### PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

Asia Minor seaboard. This festival, the Panionia, presumably held on an annual or penteteric basis, naturally involved the sending of official delegates and competitors by the cities of Ionia to the festival. Caspari believes that the Panionia must pre-date the Delian festival recorded in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, and supposes that the term Panionia would not have been applied to the festival if the Delian Ionian celebration were already in existence. It is, however, clear that the Ionians of Asia Minor conceived of themselves as a separate group of Ionians, as is shown by the strong and enduring tradition of the twelve Ionian cities in Asia Minor. Even if the Delian festival was already in existence, it is still probable that the Ionians of Asia Minor would have taken the title of the Panionia for their festival, and called the place where they celebrated their festival the Panionion. It is possible that the *Iliad* may also refer to the celebration of this festival, and if so, this gives an eighth-century date for the foundation of this ethnic pilgrimage.<sup>25</sup>

The Panionion was an area of sacred land on Mykale (a promontory of the mainland opposite the island of Samos), facing the north, and dedicated to Poseidon Helikonios. It was customary for the Ionians to assemble here regularly and celebrate the Panionia, the main activity of which was presumably a sacrifice to Poseidon. In addition there were agones (contests), at least in the second century BC.<sup>26</sup> It was not only a religious centre but could be the focal point for political activity and it was at the Panionion that the Ionians assembled when they met to rebel against Cyrus, all except Miletos, which had come to an agreement with the king. Later, when the Ionians rebelled in the reign of Darius, they met in the same place.<sup>27</sup>

Herodotos records that the twelve Ionian cities of Asia Minor (namely Miletos, Myous, Priene, Ephesos, Kolophon, Lebedos, Teos, Klazomenai, Phokaia, Samos, Chios and Erythrai) built a shrine for themselves, called the Panionion, to which the other Ionian cities were denied access. In fact, only the city of Smyrna asked to be accepted as a member, and Herodotos here presumably means its request was accepted, which is confirmed by Pausanias and Strabo. The Panionia was celebrated in the classical period by these twelve Ionian poleis, the original members, with Smyrna as a later addition.<sup>28</sup> In the literary sources the koinon is usually referred to simply as a gathering of the Ionians at the Panionion;

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

an epigraphic source gives what can be taken as the official title: 'the koinon of the Ionians'.<sup>29</sup>

All the cities were in close proximity to the Panionion, and Herodotos implies that the festival was of some importance, so there is no reason not to assume that the Panionia would have attracted many participants. The popularity of this pilgrimage would have relied entirely upon the spirit of association amongst the cities that were involved. As the koinon was still meeting in the second century BC, it provides an example of a localised pilgrimage of long duration, continuing for several hundred years, and more, if it survived into the Roman period. It is worth noting that the arrangements for the synoikismos (amalgamation) of Lebedos and Teos in the late fourth century involved the sharing of tents by the theoroi of these two places when they were attending the Panionia.<sup>30</sup>

It has often been assumed that the koinon was disbanded by the Persians after the defeat of the Ionians at the battle of Lade in the fifth century which ended the Ionian revolt and their quest for freedom, and that it was revived after the conquest of the Persian Empire by Alexander the Great; at this point it was still based on the Panionion.<sup>31</sup> But while Herodotos writes of the Ionians and the Panionion and the Panionia in the context of the Ionian revolt, he makes no comment about the Panionia in his own time, and gives no evidence that the koinon was disbanded by the Persians. Caspari cites evidence from the Persian occupation, regarding the possible dissolution of the koinon, and notes that in the fifth century Artaphernes, the Persian satrap of Sardis, sent for representatives from all the Ionian states and forced them by oath to settle their differences by arbitration, rather than by fighting. This is taken as an indication that the koinon was not in existence at the time.<sup>32</sup> This, however, must be set against the history of arbitration amongst the Ionian states, for example, the dispute between Priene and Samos in the second century, which was arbitrated not by the koinon though this was in existence at the time, but by Rhodes, a non-member of the koinon, and a Dorian state as well.<sup>33</sup>

Diodoros records that traditionally the Ionians met at the Panionion near Mykale, but that later on, as wars arose in this region, the Ionians were unable to celebrate the Panionia there, and so transferred the festival to a safe place, near Ephesos. This transference of the festival to another site can probably be equated

with the Ephesia of which Thucydides writes, while Wilamowitz and Caspari take the Ephesian celebration as evidence of the dissolution of the league.<sup>34</sup> Diodoros gives the information concerning the move in a fourth-century context (that is, in the fourth century the Ephesian celebration was in existence). His account states that because of wars in the area the Ionians moved the festival to Ephesos after consulting Delphi. Clearly, the Ephesian celebration of Diodoros is the fifth-century Ephesia of Thucydides, the relocated Panionia.

In Diodoros' account, the Ionians in deciding to move the festival to Ephesos were told by the oracle to take copies of the ancestral altars from Helike, on the northern coast of the Corinthian Gulf. This was opposed by the people of Helike as they had an oracle that they would suffer when Ionians sacrificed at the altar of Poseidon at Helike. The Ionians sacrificed, as allowed to do so by the Achaean League, but the people of Helike scattered the possessions of the Ionians and seized their *theoroi*, thereby committing sacrilege. For this they were duly punished: Poseidon destroyed the city by earthquake and tidal wave.<sup>35</sup>

Presumably, therefore, the festival was still celebrated at Ephesos in the fourth century, and the conditions that caused the move persisted, or the festival, having been transferred to Ephesos, remained there by force of circumstances. There is no evidence that the *koinon* was dissolved, and there is therefore no need to postulate its refoundation, either by Alexander the Great of Macedon, by Antigonos, or by the *Diadochoi*.<sup>36</sup>

By the end of the fourth century, the Panionia was once again being celebrated at the Panionion. However, this does not seem to have remained the case in the hellenistic period. The celebration of the Panionia which is recorded in the letter of Eumenes II of 167/6 to the Ionian *koinon* took place at Miletos, and not at the Panionion.<sup>37</sup> The question then is whether the celebration of the Panionia at Miletos in 167/6 constituted a special occurrence or otherwise, and it is possible that the Panionia was celebrated in different cities at this period, in the same way as the festival established in honour of Alexander was rotated amongst the Ionian cities. The *koinon*, amongst other honours for Eumenes, arranged that a day in his honour be celebrated at each Panionia.

The cities of the Ionian league were not only involved in the worship of Poseidon at the Panionia, but after their liberation by Alexander celebrated a festival in his honour, which apparently



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

took place on the date of Alexander's birthday. It is generally agreed that the festival was established in the lifetime of Alexander, for festivals in honour of deceased individuals were never celebrated on their birthdays, the idea apparently being that the dead should not be honoured on the day on which they had been born.<sup>38</sup> In the third century there is evidence to suggest that the festival in honour of Alexander was hosted by the members of the league on a rotational basis, but in Strabo's day it was held at Teos, and this festival took the usual form of contests and sacrifices.<sup>39</sup> These would have attracted participants from the member cities, and presumably there were official delegations sent to represent the cities and to make sacrifices on their behalf.

The Panionion celebration seems to have gained additional features with the development of the hellenistic kingdoms, such as the sacrifice to Alexander, and a day's celebration in honour of Eumenes. This regular pilgrimage was not only a traditional expression of unity amongst the Ionians, but served in the hellenistic period as a demonstration of political loyalty to the monarchs who determined to what extent these cities were to retain their freedom. On the other hand, this festival remained particularly an expression of the cultural unity of the *koinon*. Significantly, this ethnic festival continued to be celebrated despite the fact that its original location was changed, showing that the important feature was the ethnicity of the occasion, not the actual sacred site itself.

#### THE DORIAN TRIOPION

There were similar pilgrimages restricted to other ethnic groups, such as the Dorians, and Herodotos compares the Panionion shrine of the Ionians with the shrine of Triopian Apollo, at which some of the Dorians in Asia Minor worshipped. This shrine was common to the Rhodian cities of Lindos, Ialysos and Kameiros, as well as to Kos, Knidos and Halikarnassos. Even other Dorians were forbidden the use of this shrine, the Triopion, and by implication all other Greeks must also have been excluded. So there were two ethnic sanctuaries in Asia Minor restricted to geographical groups within the broader ethnē of the Dorians and Ionians. In fact, the first five of the Dorian cities later even excluded Halikarnassos from the use of the shrine, according to Herodotos, when a member of this city broke one of the regulations of the festival.

#### PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

In the contests in honour of Triopian Apollo bronze tripods were awarded to the victor, but it was necessary for the victors to dedicate them to the god in the temple. A victor from Halikarnassos ignored this ruling, and took his tripod home, and as a result the city was henceforth excluded from participation in the festival by the other five cities. For this reason the cities that participated were no longer known as the 'six-cities' (hexapolis) but as the 'five-cities' (pentapolis).<sup>40</sup> The festival must have been a major item in the local calendar, and it can be safely assumed that it formed the occasion of a pilgrimage by the inhabitants of the five (formerly six) cities involved.

#### THE KOINON OF THE ILIANS

Within Asia Minor, there was also a koinon in the region of the Troad, a political body which also met to celebrate the Panathenaia, a federal festival held in honour of Athena. The member cities were the city of Ilium (Ilion) and its neighbours, and it is first attested in the late fourth century. Magie argues that there were nine members, on the basis of *I. Ilion* 107, where there is a reference to nine members of the synedrion (governing body). The inscription is late and Frisch plausibly suggests that there were originally eleven and that *I. Ilion* 107 testifies to a change in later times. These eleven were: Ilium, Lampsakos, Abydos, Dardanos, Assos, Parion, Alexandria Troas, Skepsis, Gargara, Kalchedon and Myrlea. The koinon may have been founded by Alexander or Antigonos,<sup>41</sup> and it had as its focus and common sanctuary the temple of Athena at Ilium, and the member cities sent representatives to Ilium 'to transact business and to celebrate the Panathenaia'.<sup>42</sup> The best source of information on the koinon is a first-century BC inscription, which deals with the monies owed to the shrine of Athena by neighbouring cities, and also describes the arrangements for the celebration of the festival.<sup>43</sup> The emphasis of the inscription on celebrating the festival as in the past implies that, despite its first-century date, it presents an accurate guide to the organisation of the festival in previous centuries.

The title 'the koinon of the Ilians' occurs only once, and generally reference is made to 'the koinon of the cities' or 'the city (of Ilium) and the other cities'. It was administered by a synedrion; the way in which the members were chosen is unknown, but presumably they were appointed or nominated by the member

states. The synedrion met at the celebration of the festival; amongst the activities of the koinon were the honouring of individual member states, the regulation of financial matters involving temple funds, and the conduct of the festivals, a Little and Great Panathenaia. The festivals were managed by this synedrion in association with agonothetai ('supervisors of the contests'). Another inscription records that the synedrion honoured the people of Parion for having chosen a particular individual to act as agoranomos ('supervisor of the market-place') for the Great Panathenaia, and presumably each member city elected an agoranomos for the festival. This particular agoranomos had ensured the supply of grain for those who had come to attend the celebration, provided a doctor for those who fell ill at the panegyris, and generally organised administrative details. The fact that one individual, through the performance of his tasks, brought honour upon the demos of Parion should be taken as an indication that the responsibilities associated with the koinon, and the celebration of its common festival, were taken seriously by the members, and that all were involved at a practical level.<sup>44</sup>

As there was both a Great and a Little Panathenaia, there could well have been a penteteric celebration as well as an annual smaller one; alternatively, there may have been two celebrations in the same year, one of greater magnitude. The Great Panathenaia celebrated by the koinon consisted of gymnastic and equestrian events; olive oil was provided, presumably for athletic competitors. Sacrifices, of course, were a major feature of the programme, and while a reference to a procession is only restored, one would certainly have taken place.<sup>45</sup>

The cities of the koinon were beset with some financial difficulties which had occasioned borrowings from the temple, and this had resulted in financial stringency. The stress on the synedrion and agonothetai making provision before all else for the Great Panathenaia could indicate problems with funding for this festival in the past, while the arrangement that the various sacrifices were to be paid for from the revenues of the goddess might conceivably reflect a previous practice whereby the member states provided the necessary sacrificial beasts. One change is apparent: the theoroi from the various states seem in the past to have been paid out of a fund, but for the next ten years, according to the inscription, the cities are to meet the costs of sending theoroi. The cutback did not apply to the central body: if the synedrion needed to send

#### PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

out theoroi or ambassadors, the agonothetai and the synedrion were to make a judgement on the subsidy necessary, based on the revenue expected from the income of the sacred land.<sup>46</sup> The koinon was composed of approximately the same number of cities as that in Ionia further south, and served the same purpose, while in the religious sphere the koinon's main festival served as a pilgrimage centre for those in the member cities, with the festival playing a role of some significance in the religious and cultural life of the cities involved.

#### THE DAIDALA AT PLATAEA

One of the most interesting religious celebrations carried out by ethnic groups in the Greek world was that of the Great Daidala, held at Plataea and to which cities from all over Boeotia sent representatives. The Great Daidala, held every sixty years, was preceded by a series of Little Daidala celebrated every four years, which were exclusively Plataean.<sup>47</sup> At the time of the Little Daidala, the Plataeans went to the forest not far from Alalkomenai where, Pausanias states, stood the largest oaks in all of Boeotia, and here they put out portions of boiled meat. Birds would flock to the meat, but the Plataeans paid attention only to the crows, and watched to see on which tree a crow alighted after having snatched some meat. Presumably it was the first crow to come along that was so observed, and so it had an oracular function.<sup>48</sup> The tree on which the crow landed was chopped down and carved into a daidalon; as Pausanias states, daidalon was the name the men of ancient times gave to a xoanon, or wooden image.

When the Great Daidala was celebrated every sixty years, fourteen of these images, one created at each of the Little Daidala since the last celebration, were ritually burned at Mount Kithairon. The Plataeans celebrated the Little Daidala every six years according to Pausanias' local informant, but Pausanias thought it must have been more frequently than this, presumably not accepting the guide's statement because to burn fourteen images every sixty years meant that there would need to be a celebration of the Little Daidala every four years (i.e. it was a penteteric celebration). At the Great Daidala all of the Boeotians participated: the festival was pan-Boeotian in character. The Plataeans were joined by the Koronaians, Thespieians, Tanagraians, Chaironeians, Orchomenians, Lebadeians and Thebans, each of whom would be responsible

for one of the Daidala (when Kassander rebuilt Thebes, the Thebans desired to be on good terms with the Plataeans, to participate in the common assembly, and to send a sacrifice to the Daidala). Pausanias also refers to 'towns of less importance', which pooled resources for the sacrifice involving the remaining six daidala. Accordingly, several of the smaller towns would combine to look after one of the daidala, and there would be six groups, made up of several towns, with each group responsible for one daidalon.<sup>49</sup>

Pausanias records that the fourteen daidala burned at the Great Daidala corresponded to the fourteen celebrations of the Little Daidala which the Plataeans had not held because of their exile. The question of which exile cannot be resolved: that of 427–387 or that of 373–338. The fact that neither exile was sixty years in length is a chronological problem without resolution.<sup>50</sup>

The first celebration of the Great Daidala in which the daidala of the time of exile were burned set a precedent. Originally, at the Daidala, one daidalon had been carved, and the aetiological myth for the festival had been acted out: the daidalon was taken to the river Asopos and washed. After this it was dressed as a bride and placed on a cart with a bridesmaid, and then taken up to Mount Kithairon and burnt. The first celebration after the exile, however, in which fourteen daidala were burnt, cannot have failed to have made a great impression on the Plataeans. The bonfire from fourteen daidala carved from oak trunks and the associated wood needed to burn these up, as well as the holocaust of sacrificial animals, must have been an awesome religious event.

The practice of burning the daidalon made at each small festival was discontinued, and they were stored away until the Great Daidala, a new festival to commemorate the ending of the Plataeans' exile. Naturally, with fourteen images, there was in fact a celebration of the sacrifice of fourteen maidens. The myth, however, was that only one maiden had been the bride-to-be of Zeus. With fourteen daidala, this became a problem, but the myth was preserved by singling out only one of the daidala at the Great Daidala for special treatment. Pausanias writes that all of the daidala were drawn in wagons away from the river to Mount Kithairon, but only one image was adorned as a bride, symbolising the archetypal bride of Zeus.

The daidalon which formed the focus of the Great Daidalon was accompanied by a bridesmaid, but how she was chosen is

#### PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

unknown. Lots were cast for which city or group of towns took a specific daidalon and again to determine the order of the wagons in the procession up to the summit of Kithairon. An altar was constructed there in the shape of a house, and the daidala placed on it. Each of the cities sacrificed a cow to Hera and a bull to Zeus; the victims, 'full of wine and incense', were placed with all the daidala. Individuals could also sacrifice, according to their means, and a holocaust of the victims took place; Pausanias notes that of all fires, this fire was the largest and could be seen from the furthest distance.

Given the number of states involved, the Great Daidala was an important pilgrimage, involving pilgrims from all over Boeotia. The representatives of the states are not termed *theoroi* by Pausanias but they had the same responsibilities as were associated with a *theoria*, as their duty was to sacrifice at the Daidala on behalf of their state. It is clear that some expense was involved in the celebration of the Great Daidala. The main cities were each responsible for one daidalon, but the smaller cities pooled resources. Each city made a sacrifice of a cow and a bull, and these did not form part of a communal feast, as they were burnt in a holocaust. In addition to this expense, there would have been others, such as the provision of animals which could be sacrificed and eaten, and there was also a wagon to be provided for each daidalon, to take it from the river Asopos to Kithairon; perhaps this was a small expense, but it needed to be organised.

Clearly, the central focus of the festival, before the introduction of the Great Daidala, was the one daidalon burned at each celebration of the Little Daidala. This wooden daidalon represented a would-be bride for Zeus who was burnt on an altar along with animal sacrifices. This can be nothing other than a reference to human sacrifice, and the ceremony would once have consisted of the sacrifice of a maiden, for whom an oak was later substituted. The girl would have been dressed for her part, carried up to the mountain, and there sacrificed, but it is uncertain whether she was burnt alive, or after being sacrificed. In the earliest form of the myth, the girl was almost certainly a bride for Zeus, sacrificed on Mount Kithairon to this god, perhaps in his capacity as a sky god. When the human sacrifice was commuted, an aetiological myth was invented to explain this: Hera was angry with Zeus and retired to Euboia. Zeus went to the river god Asopos for advice about how to win Hera over. Asopos advised him to announce that he

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

was going to marry Plataea, Asopos' daughter. A wooden image was put on a wagon as part of a marriage ceremony. Hera in anger came to Plataea and tore off the coverings of the daidalon, was amused at Zeus' ruse, and they were reconciled. At the festival, Hera was placated with a sacrifice of a cow by each of the fourteen groups involved, with the bull as an offering for Zeus.

There are examples in Greek religion of human sacrifices which were commuted.<sup>51</sup> It has been argued that one aspect of the myth, the bathing of the image, 'looks very much like a ritual renewal of the cult image'.<sup>52</sup> Each daidalon, however, was burned; the image was not renewed but destroyed, and the daidalon itself was not a cult image. It was not worshipped but sacrificed, and it was not a deity but an offering to a deity.

The sacrifice of a human, dedicated to a god, was an act of intense violence – the sacrifice of a human life. This life must have been thought to come into contact with the divine if the sacrifice was a form of sacred marriage. Similarly, the wooden bride which was burned must also have been thought to represent a living bride for Zeus. The uniting of a member of the community, a beautiful virgin, with the sky god in a ritual holocaust would have served to unite the god with the sacrificers in a community of interest. The sacrifice boded good for the community, and the fruits of the symbolic marriage would be beneficial to the community, which the sky god would continue to assist.

#### LESSER-KNOWN LEAGUE – ISLAND AND ITALIAN FESTIVALS

In addition to the better-known leagues, there were various other league festivals, and some islands celebrated festivals which attracted participation from throughout the island, and even from further afield. The Greeks in Italy also held festivals but there is little evidence about these. The Boeotians celebrated not only the Great Daidala but also the Pamboeotia, a religious festival which complemented the Boeotian League's political activity.<sup>53</sup> Similarly, the Aetolian League held its annual 'agorai and panegyreis' at the temple of Apollo at Thermos, at which contests were held. De Ligt argues that here 'agorai and panegyreis' refers to political assemblies (rather than markets) and festivals.<sup>54</sup>

Strabo writes that at Troizen there had been an inviolate sanctuary of Poseidon and an amphictyonic league of seven cities

associated with it (until at least the end of the fourth century BC) which shared in the sacrifice there: Hermione, Epidauros, Aegina, Athens, Prasieis, Nauplion, and Orchomenos Minyeios.<sup>55</sup> The Akarnanian League from about 200 BC celebrated a league festival and market at the temple of Apollo at Actium.<sup>56</sup> The Arcadian League in the fourth century, after the founding of Megalopolis with the liberation of the Messenian helots from the Spartans, had the mountain sanctuary of Zeus Lykaeos on Mt Lykaeos, a few kilometres from Megalopolis, as its religious centre, and the sanctuary and cult here were important in unifying the league.<sup>57</sup> After the sack of Corinth in 146, the ethnic leagues were dissolved by the Romans, but only for a few years.<sup>58</sup>

The Italian Greek states also had common festivals. There was a festival of Hera at Lakinion, to which all the Italian Greeks went, and either Kroton or Sybaris was said to have tried to do away with the Olympian festival by holding contests at the same time as the Olympia and offering valuable silver prizes.<sup>59</sup>

Festivals on large islands seem to have had a similar character to ethnic festivals: the festival of Artemis Amarynthia at Amarynthos (a short distance outside the city of Eretria) on Euboia attracted not only the nearby Eretrians, but also Karystians from the south of the island. Presumably other Euboians also came to this festival, and Apollo's festival at Tamynai on Euboia similarly attracted participants from all over the island and while competitors in its musical, gymnastic and equestrian events came largely from Euboia there were also contestants from Thebes, and one contestant from Syracuse is also known. Competitions on Euboia are also mentioned by Hesiod, Pindar and Bacchylides. In the hellenistic period, kings sent theoriai to the festival of Helios held at the city of Rhodes, which was attended by competitors from throughout the Greek world. The island of Tenos had only a small city but great hestiatoria, dining halls, had been built there, as their neighbours came in large numbers to participate in the Poseidonia festival.<sup>60</sup>

The cave of Zeus Idaeos on Mt Ida in Crete was some 32 kilometres from Knossos by a road used by those who visited the cave. There were shade trees along the road under which travellers could rest in stifling weather. Mysteries were celebrated here, and a chorus of initiates in Euripides' *The Cretans* sings that they wear white clothes, avoid contact with birth or burial, and abstain from all meat. Pythagoras was said to have been an initiate, and with



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

his head covered with a black ram's fleece to have lain beside the sea at dawn and a river at night, and then to have gone into the cave wearing black wool; then, after 'thrice nine days' sacrificed to Zeus, who was identified with the Cretan Zan. The nearby city of Gortyn celebrated a triennial sacrifice at the cave, and required the city of Rhittania, apparently in a subservient relationship with Gortyn, to send 350 staters' worth of sacrificial victims, or money and victims.<sup>61</sup>

#### NEIGHBOURHOOD FESTIVALS

There were other festivals at centres which did not bring worshippers from all over the Greek world, but which did attract visitors from the city organising the cult and from the neighbouring area. Often these could involve a fairly short journey for the worshippers. For example, the festival of Artemis Skillous, near Olympia, organised and instituted by Xenophon, attracted men and women from around the area. They had to encamp in tents, which may have meant that they had come from places which were too far away for them to travel to Skillous and back again in one day,<sup>62</sup> although some worshippers from even quite near might have chosen to stay at the site for the atmosphere, and because they might be weary after the day's festivities.

Strabo records that 30 stades (about 6 kilometres) from Nysa in Asia Minor there was a sanctuary at Leimon where the inhabitants of Nysa and 'all the people about' went to celebrate their festivals. The distance involved might not qualify these celebrations for the definition of pilgrimage on a grand scale, but it surely qualifies as a local pilgrimage. Thirty stades is not a short distance for men accompanied by women, and presumably children, to travel, presumably requiring at least two hours on foot. Given the distance involved the people of Nysa may well have spent a night or more at Leimon, even though Strabo does not state this explicitly.<sup>63</sup> Such local festivals, attracting pilgrims from the surrounding area, must have been common throughout the Greek world.

Sanctuaries outside the boundaries of a city-state but close enough to be easily accessible from the city would also be the object of pilgrimages. The healing sanctuary at Oropos, sometimes politically part of Boeotia and sometimes Attica, is a case in hand. The sanctuary of Apollo Ptoios in Boeotia received dedications from Athens. Two well-known examples include the dedication

#### PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

of an inscribed marble Doric capital by Alkmeonides, brother of Megakles, Peisistratos' sometime ally and sometime opponent, for his victory in a chariot-race at the Panathenaia. It has been argued that this victory dates to 546, and that Alkmeonides dedicated this at the Ptoion because with Peisistratos taking power in 546 and the Alkmeonidai going into exile as a consequence, he did not have time to make a dedication on the acropolis, and had to make a pilgrimage in exile to the Ptoion to make the dedication. Hipparchos, son of Peisistratos, also made a dedication at the Ptoion, and it has been suggested that this was for a horse-race victory.<sup>64</sup>

#### ATHENIAN EMPIRE FESTIVALS

Of importance too are the various 'empire festivals' to which Athenian colonists and allies sent offerings. Athenian colonies and allies were required by Athenian decrees to bring various items to the most important Athenian festivals: colonists to the City Dionysia each year, colonists and allies to the Great Panathenaia every four years, and allies (and almost certainly colonists) annually to Eleusis. These were compulsory pilgrimages, as each state would need to choose and send an embassy to participate in these festivals. The Great Panathenaia was the 'empire' festival *par excellence*, and arrangements concerning allies' and colonists' involvement were part of a deliberate programme specifically designed to strengthen Ionian identification with the 'mother polis' Athens.<sup>65</sup>

The Panathenaia was organised in 566, and received a great deal of official sponsorship under Peisistratos and his sons in the period of the tyranny, 546–510 BC. The term refers either to a celebration by 'all the Athenians' or that it was a festival in honour of 'Panathena'. There was presumably always a festival in honour of Athena, with the 566 festival a reorganisation.<sup>66</sup> The Panathenaia was possibly an attempt to rival the other festivals established or reorganised at about this time, the Pythia (586 and 582), Isthmia (582 or 580), and Nemea (573), and the Pythian contests of Kleisthenes of Sikyon, all imitations of the Olympic festival which by the end of the seventh century was panhellenic in nature. Although it never rivalled the other four panhellenic festivals, the Panathenaia did nevertheless attract competitors from throughout the Greek world, and in the fifth century was a festival attended by representatives of Athens' allies. The Panathenaia was

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

held annually, with an especially magnificent celebration every fourth year, which was known as the Great Panathenaia.

The procession for the festival took place each year on Hekatombaion 28, the date assigned by myth as Athena's birthday; the Parthenon frieze has frequently been interpreted as representing this procession, reflecting cult rather than myth, but other scholars see it as the foundation (aetiological) myth for the festival.<sup>67</sup>

The Panathenaic procession started at the Pompeion, outside the Dipylon Gate in the Kerameikos, and made its way along the Panathenaic Way to the acropolis.<sup>68</sup> A peplos, depicting the battle of the gods and giants, was woven each year and presented to the goddess. It was attached to the mast of a ship which could not of course go up to the acropolis, and so the peplos sail was removed, carried to the Parthenon and presented to the goddess. Naturally, a peplos the size of a sail was not meant to be presented to the goddess as a dress to be worn (Athena Polias had a small cult statue in the Erechtheion, too small for a peplos the size of a sail, and there was also the large statue of Athena Parthenos, already dressed in gold, in the Parthenon). It was presumably dedicated in the Parthenon and stored there. Pausanias saw the ship 'docked' near the Areiopagos. Clearly the ship making its way from the Kerameikos to the base of the acropolis was a tremendous feature of the procession.<sup>69</sup>

The evidence of the Panathenaic vases points to athletic and equestrian events very early on in the history of the Panathenaia; the fourth-century list of competitions includes a wide variety of events but whether these were always part of the programme or were added over time is not ascertainable: pankration, wrestling, the stade (foot-race), pentathlon, boxing, horse- and chariot-races, javelin throwing from horseback, the apobates (apparently involving a hoplite getting on and off a chariot as it raced to the finish line, depicted on the Parthenon frieze), a torch-race, boat-race, race in armour, a tribal contest in 'manly-excellence' (the euandria), kithara and flute-playing, and pyrrhic (victory) dancing. There was also the anthippasia (the 'riding opposite'), which involved tribal squadrons on horses, with five squadrons at each end of the hippodrome, charging and running through each other's formations, stopping at the opposite end of the hippodrome and charging again, three times all together, at the sound of trumpet blasts.

Musical contests may have been introduced by Perikles, but

possibly were in existence earlier. The best-known musical contest was that of the rhapsodes, who recited Homer: Hipparchos, Peisistratos' second son and referred to by the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* as one 'who loved the arts', organised the rules for the recitation of Homer and set a standard text for the recitations. All of these contests would have taken place over several days. The Panathenaic amphorai given as prizes are well known. These were filled with olive oil, with an inscription 'of the games from Athens' and a figure of Athena on the front of the vases, and the contest in which the prize had been won depicted on the back. Prizes also took the form of money.<sup>70</sup>

One of the features of the Panathenaia, as with other festivals, was the distribution of the sacrificed meat to the public, but in the case of the Little Panathenaia, an inscription specifically has the meat being distributed according to deme, meaning that non-Athenian visitors were not eligible. If this also applied to the Great Panathenaia, which delegates from allied states attended, then presumably they ate of the sacrifice which they made on behalf of their state.<sup>71</sup>

In the Athenian decree for Erythrai of c. 453/2, which seems to have been passed after the unsuccessful revolt of Erythrai, the Erythraians are ordered to bring grain or victims for sacrifice (depending on the restoration) to the Great Panathenaia, of not less than 3 minas in value. The decree then goes on to make other arrangements, of a political nature, for the city, and clearly the involvement in the Great Panathenaia is to be seen in the context of Athenian political control over Erythrai.<sup>72</sup> Several decades later, this individual arrangement for bringing an offering to the Great Panathenaia finds much fuller and somewhat different expression in a decree of 425/4.

Thoudippos' decree which reassessed amounts of Athenian tribute in 425/4 decreed that the allies were to bring a cow and a panoply (of arms) to the Great Panathenaia, every four years, and to take part in the procession. The phrase following this has been restored to read 'in the same way as [the] colonists'.<sup>73</sup> The validity of this restoration rests upon the decree concerning the foundation of the Athenian colony of Brea (c. 445–430, and so preceding Thoudippos' decree), in which the colonists are required to bring a cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia.<sup>74</sup> That this was a traditional practice is also made clear by the decree concerning Paros: in 372 the Athenians granted Paros the right of

bringing a cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia (and a cow and phallus to the Dionysia), on the grounds that they were Athenian colonists.<sup>75</sup> Cargill correctly points out that for Athens' colonies in the fifth century, the obligation to send these offerings to Athenian festivals was not a reminder of their imperial subject status but of their traditional links with Athens. This was obviously seen as a privilege by Paros, and despite the compulsory nature of the offering some allies may also have seen their participation in the same light. Colonists traditionally sent a cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia, and in 425 this colonial obligation was extended to the allies.

The allies were now like Athens' 'colonists', and Athens was asserting a closer relationship with the allies. This placing of the allies in the same category as the colonists diminished their independence. The decree proposed by Thoudippos to increase tribute payment and to compel the allies to bring a cow and panoply to the Great Panathenaia was followed by a decree proposed by Kleinias enforcing this measure by providing for punishment in cases where the allies failed to bring the required offering. This decree has sometimes been dated to 447, but the second half of the 420s is more appropriate: Thoudippos' decree of 425 makes the offerings compulsory, and Kleinias' measure to punish those who do not comply must follow on from Thoudippos' decree.<sup>76</sup> Athens, despite the fact that some allies such as Byzantium were Dorians, was probably attempting to stress her role as the mother city of the Ionians.<sup>77</sup> Originally an Athenian festival, it became a festival involving first her colonists and then the allies, even Dorians, bringing specific offerings; genuine ethnic homogeneity was changed and Athens' Dorian allies became 'Ionian' because of the nature of their relationship with Athens.

In addition, the allies were obliged to attend the City Dionysia, held annually at Athens. The requirement that the tribute be brought then meant that the Athenians had the sailing season to chase up defaulters.<sup>78</sup> The foundation decree of Brea compels the colony to send a phallus to the (City) Dionysia.<sup>79</sup> There is no evidence that allies were also required to provide a phallus for the City Dionysia, but they may well have been so required.<sup>80</sup> The tribute was divided into talents and brought on to the stage of the theatre in the presence of the allies who had brought it to Athens. This was clearly intended as a display of Athenian power.<sup>81</sup> The City Dionysia with the allies' phalli and bags of tribute, and the

#### PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

performance of plays, was obviously a big occasion. Aristophanes contrasts the foreigners in the crowds at the plays of the City Dionysia with the all-Athenian audience at the plays of the Lenaia, a festival held during the winter when the seas were closed to ships.<sup>82</sup>

#### FIRST-FRUIT TO ELEUSIS

The Athenians in c. 422 decreed that they themselves were to offer first-fruits to 'the two goddesses' at Eleusis 'in accordance with ancestral custom and the oracle of Delphi': 1/600th of their barley and 1/1200th of their wheat. In addition, the allies were ordered to offer first-fruits in the same proportion. The allies are specifically mentioned, but the decree also commands the hierophant and torch-bearer of the Eleusinian Mysteries to proclaim at the Mysteries that the 'Greeks are to offer first-fruits in accordance with ancestral custom and the oracle from Delphi'. In addition the boule was to proclaim to the other Greek cities that the Athenians and their allies were offering first-fruits, 'not ordering... but encouraging' the other Greek cities to do likewise. Barley and wheat are specifically mentioned in the decree; first-fruits of olive oil were still under consideration but the matter was to be brought before the demos later on.<sup>83</sup> Meiggs sees this decree in the context of the Athenian revival of the Delian festival, and it is not difficult to see both as part of a specific religious policy,<sup>84</sup> and of Athens' cultural dominance. But while the Athenians make it compulsory for themselves and their allies, and invite the other Greek cities to do likewise, the fact that in the fourth century most Greek cities were sending first-fruits to Athens and that the Pythian priestess would command those who weren't, to do so, implies that the level of coercion necessary to have the allies bring first-fruits to Eleusis was low. Athenian cleruchies sent contributions to Eleusis in 329/8, and presumably in other years as well. The Athenians settled on Lemnos dedicated a statue of Athena by Pheidias on the Athenian acropolis, and it is to be imagined that they sent out an embassy on a pious pilgrimage to dedicate this offering, in their native land to their native goddess. Parker notes that cleruchs in places like Aegina and Salamis 'were in fact physically closer to Athens than were the inhabitants of the outlying demes, and may have continued to attend the city festivals'.<sup>85</sup>

Athens presumably made these arrangements for colonists and

allies to participate in these festivals (the Panathenaia, City Dionysia and Eleusinian Mysteries) to underline its role as mother city of their colonists and indirectly of their mainly Ionian allies, of which she was the legendary mother city. Naturally this reinforced leadership over all their allies, including Dorian members of the Athenian alliance. These measures are to be seen in the context of Athenian leadership in the revival of the four-yearly festival on Delos, which also asserted Athens' primacy amongst the Ionians.

While modern authors have argued that the empire was coercive and that the allies did not wish to be under Athens' control, a case can be made that they did not view these religious obligations with distaste. Unfortunately, these obligations leave little trace in the literary record, and the evidence is mainly epigraphic. While the Xenophontic *Athenaion Politeia* complains about Athenian treatment of the allies and how they are compelled to come to Athens for judicial proceedings, it makes no mention of the religious obligations of the allies. Meiggs, in fact, has argued that the allied representatives who attended the drama staged at the Dionysia would have enjoyed the spectacle and felt pride at being involved.<sup>86</sup>

It is clear that such participation in religious festivals was regarded favourably. For example, the demos of Priene decreed, in 326/5, that it send two theoroi with offerings and sacrifices to participate in each Great Panathenaia. Priene, as an Ionian 'colony' of Athens, was obviously attempting to strengthen its relationship with Athens, and Athens by requesting such participation of all the allies in the fifth century had been attempting to do likewise. Two other colonies, Kolophon and Paros, sent offerings of a cow and panoply to the Panathenaia in the fourth century.<sup>87</sup> Moreover, the Epidaurians in the fourth century BC granted to their colony Astypalaia the right to include their sacrificial animals in the procession of the Epidaurians: obviously this was seen by both parties as a privilege and an honour.<sup>88</sup>

Other mother cities also imposed religious obligations upon their colonies which would have involved the selection of ambassadors to present the required offering, a form of official pilgrimage. Miletos, at least in the hellenistic period, required colonies to send an offering to Apollo at Didyma.<sup>89</sup> Thucydides states that the Corinthians hated the Corcyraeans because the latter disregarded them, even though they were their colonists, and did not give the Corinthians 'the customary honours in their common festivals,

#### PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

nor served the Corinthians with the first portion of the sacrifices, as the other colonies did'. Clearly two types of festivals are involved: festivals at Corinth in which all Corinth's colonies were expected to participate, and festivals at Corcyra which a Corinthian representative or representatives would attend.<sup>90</sup>

#### CONCLUSION

Pilgrimages made by members of a particular ethnic group were obviously an important religious experience and took place on a regular basis. The nature of the pilgrimage activity, a sacrifice, or a festival involving musical, gymnastic and other contests, was the same as for other cults. It was the clientele which was different. The exclusiveness of locality and of ethnicity was added to the usual variables in determining who would go on a pilgrimage. How those not belonging to a particular ethnic group were debarred from a particular celebration is unknown. Those, however, who were not of the same ethnicity as those attending the festival would presumably have simply not attended; dialect differences could have betrayed the intruder. The number of these festivals indicates that they were considered to be important in promoting cohesiveness, and that they reflected an ethnic 'consciousness'.

Ethnic pilgrimages involved a specific group of people, such as the Dorians or Ionians, unlike the panhellenic festivals. At other festivals, such as the Olympia, the festival was the responsibility of the state in which the festival was being celebrated: ethnic pilgrimages involved more group participation. The Eleians were responsible for the Olympic festival, and jealously guarded the prerogative. The ethnic pilgrimage involving the Troad koinon, in contrast, involved the cities working together to celebrate the festival. For the Daidala, the Plataeans organised the festival and provided the daidala, but the expense of the sacrifice of these daidala was shared out amongst the cities, with smaller cities pooling resources in some cases. Ethnic pilgrimages were localised, and those in the immediate vicinity attended; the Boeotians went to the Daidala, Ionians to the Delia, and the Ionians and Dorians of Asia Minor to the Panionion and Triopion respectively. The advantage of such festivals was that for those involved the festival site was usually nearer than for a panhellenic event. Italians might travel all the way to Asia Minor for a festival, but for the people



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

of Thebes, Plataea was close at hand. Yet the local nature of the festivals did not mean that they were insignificant. These festivals at Delos and Plataea, for example, were on a grand scale: the bonfire of the Boeotians could be seen for miles.

The ethnic festivals of Asia Minor, the Panathenaia of the koinon of Ilians, the Panionia, and the festival of Triopian Apollo, involved the main cities of the Greek seaboard of Asia Minor. The festivals indicate that pilgrimage was important as a feature of the religious activity of Greek Asia Minor. The main benefit of these festivals was that they enhanced and further promoted a group awareness and helped to preserve ethnic identity. This presumably explains the existence of such celebrations. Pilgrims attending these festivals, either as Ionians, Dorians or Boeotians, did so in order to strengthen their consciousness of their own ethnicity and reinforce cultural links with neighbours sharing their own traditions.

## CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

Evidence about regulations dealing with sacred matters can be drawn from several sites. Regulations governing the method of worship at sites such as Oropos, Epidauros, Pergamon, Kos, Lebadeia, Eleusis, Delphi, Andania, Lykosoura and other cult centres should be taken as applying to pilgrims, for they were the main body of worshippers at these sites. Panhellenic pilgrimage centres provide a great deal of information about religious requirements for the visitor, and in the following discussion regulations at some purely local sanctuaries will also be dealt with, to indicate that both local sanctuaries and those drawing a wider clientele had similar cult laws. Such a comparative phenomenology of cult practices within the Greek world provides a comprehensive view of what was required of pilgrim worshippers.

### ENTRY TO THE SACRED SITE

Obviously, the most important prerequisite for a pilgrim visiting any sacred place was the ability to enter the sacred site. Various sanctuaries in the Greek world restricted access to the temple itself, both for locals and outsiders.<sup>1</sup> A worshipper, above all, had to be pure in order to enter a sanctuary,<sup>2</sup> and there were various regulations concerned with this. In addition, some regulations specifically discriminated against outsiders, and injunctions against Dorians and Aetolians worshipping at some sanctuaries will be discussed below.

Panhellenic festivals, such as the Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia and Nemea, and the Mysteries at Eleusis and Samothrace, were open to all Greeks. But some pilgrimage events were specifically for certain ethnic groups: the Ionians and the Dorians, for example,

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

had their own festivals, from which others were excluded. The Spartan king Kleomenes I was refused entry to the temple of Hera at Argos, on the grounds that it was unholy for strangers to sacrifice there, and he reacted by having the priest dragged away and flogged, before proceeding to make his sacrifice. In a similar incident, Kleomenes was told by the priestess of Athena's temple on the Athenian acropolis that he could not enter the temple, as no Dorians were permitted to do so.<sup>3</sup> These would appear to be cases where a worshipper who came to a temple was discriminated against, but on the other hand the antipathy of the Argives and Athenians towards the Spartans may have provoked these responses to Kleomenes on political grounds in both cases, rather than being examples of religious restrictions against pilgrims. A decree of the people of Arkesine of Amorgos in the third century BC, which orders the neokoros (custodian) of the shrine of Hera to ensure that no xenos (stranger) came and stayed in the shrine, did not aim at excluding pilgrims from visiting it but was probably a precaution intended to stop transients from sleeping there; the neokoros would be fined 10 drachmas a day if he did not keep xenoï (strangers) out of the shrine.<sup>4</sup>

The prohibition against Dorians in Athena's temple on the acropolis, however, is paralleled in a fifth-century inscription recording that entry of Dorians into a shrine on the Ionian island of Paros was forbidden. On Mykonos, after the synoikismos which took place in about 200 BC, xenoï (strangers) were excluded from one particular day of cult activity, a provision presumably aimed at strengthening the ties amongst those involved in the synoikismos or perhaps reflecting an established exclusivity of the cult activity; the festivities were for citizens only. On the other hand, even the xenophobic Spartans had a festival, the Gymnopaïdai, which xenoï could attend. There were various myths explaining why the Eleians chose to bar themselves from the Isthmian festival, and Plutarch records that in his own town, Chaironeia in Boeotia, the neokoros (temple guardian) stood before the shrine of Leukothea and taking a whip in hand proclaimed: 'Let no male or female slave enter, nor male or female Aetolian.' At Athens, the Gephyraioi clan had shrines for their own use at which the other Athenians could not worship.<sup>5</sup>

In a few cases, but by no means all, the worshippers might be denied entry to a shrine because a priest or priestess needed to be present during the act of worship. However, regulations

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

requiring the presence of priests and priestesses need not necessarily have been religious in origin, for it seems that in Greece at most shrines anyone could undertake sacrifice, as long as the ritual rules were observed.<sup>6</sup> An insight about how regulations restricting the access of worshippers to temples came into being can be seen from another decree from Arkesine on Amorgos. The decree concerns the priestess of Demeter at Arkesine, who came before the prytany of the boule and made a report about public sacrifices at the shrine, also complaining about the women who were making use of it. The boule and the demos subsequently passed a decree on this:<sup>7</sup> female worshippers were no longer to be allowed into the shrine unless the priestess was present. Clearly the women had committed some wrong, either of a religious or perhaps of a secular nature, in the absence of the priestess and in future were to be denied access to the shrine without the priestess accompanying them.

A similar situation can be seen in the decree of the Knidians, who resolved to forbid anyone sleeping in future in the temple of Dionysos, the reason for this being that a group of Bakchoi (Bacchantes) had slept there recently. The Bakchoi had done something in the temple which was not acceptable to the community – damaging the shrine while they were in a state of enthousiasmos – and the community resolved to forbid sleeping in the temple.<sup>8</sup> If the information concerning the prohibition on sleeping had come in a different form, for example, as a general prohibition mentioned, say, by Pausanias without reference to a historical event, the temptation to look for a religious reason for the prohibition would have been strong. However, the decree indicates that a practical concern was at the heart of the prohibition, and this was probably also the case with the decree of Arkesine concerning the women whose entry to the shrine was restricted. It is probable that restrictions regarding access to temples arose because of the unacceptable behaviour of worshippers, and concerns raised by the priests about their activities in the shrine.

There was a prohibition on the participation of slaves at the annual festival at Plataea, due to the fact that the men who died during 480–479 did so on behalf of freedom. Slaves, who had been taken along for servile tasks by their masters who made the pilgrimage in order to honour at the festival those who had died in the war, would not be allowed to attend.<sup>9</sup> This contrasts with

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the Eleusinian, Samothracian and Andanian mysteries, into which slaves could be and were initiated.<sup>10</sup>

Access to some temples was only permitted to the public on certain days of the year, with only the priest or priestess being allowed unlimited access. Some temples and sanctuaries could only be entered by cult personnel. In some cases even their access was restricted. At certain sites, however, entry could be restricted to a particular group, and this provision usually worked in favour of the pilgrim. The sanctuary of Isis, administered by the Tithoreans, required that the worshipper be sent a dream of 'invitation' by the goddess before entering. At the village of Acharaka (between Tralles and Nysa in Asia Minor), there was a Ploutonion which comprised a precinct of Ploutos and Kore and a cave, the Charonion, in the hill above which was the centre of a healing cult based on dream interpretation. The priests of the shrine would sleep in the cave and apply their interpretation of their own dreams to the illnesses of individuals who had come to the site in search of healing and who stayed in the village. They would often take the invalids into the cave and leave them there. Only the priests and the ill were allowed at the site: 'to all others the place is forbidden and deadly.' The pilgrim in search of a cure was of course given special treatment, because the cult centre was designed for the ill.<sup>11</sup>

Equally as inconvenient as the shrine which was totally inaccessible to the uninitiated was the shrine which opened only once a year. Pausanias records that the temple of Dionysos the Deliverer in Boeotia was open only on certain consecutive days, once a year, and it is clear that he visited the shrine when it was closed; similarly, he writes that the sanctuary of Eurynome was opened on the same day each year, but he did not visit when the festival was held and so did not see Eurynome's statue. At another place he was luckier: the sanctuary of the Mother Dindymene near the river Dirke in Boeotia, where Pindar himself had dedicated the image of Dindymene, was opened only one day a year, and Pausanias was there on that day. The temple of Artemis at Hyampolis was opened only twice a year, and Pausanias writes that he cannot therefore describe her cult statue. The statue of Hera at Aigion in Achaia could only be seen by the priestess, while the sanctuary of Zeus Lykaeos at Megalopolis had no entrance; similarly, no one was allowed into the temenos of Zeus Lykaeos on Mt Lykaeos.<sup>12</sup>

Panhellenic sanctuaries were always 'open', but in many cases

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

the main cult activity, such as the Olympic festival at Olympia, occurred infrequently: every four years in this case. The Lesser and Greater Eleusinian Mysteries were celebrated once a year, while at Samothrace the inscribed lists of the *mystai* give the dates when initiation took place, from April through to November, so that it seems that whenever enough people arrived for an initiation ceremony, one was held.

Most of the healing shrines, it appears, were open on a full yearly basis for obvious reasons, and there is no evidence to suggest that the healing sanctuaries opened their doors to the sick only at specific periods or seasons. For this reason, healing sanctuaries never invited the sick through special embassies (*theoriai*), but there are indications that seasonal factors did affect the attendance rates at healing shrines. An inscription from Oropos instructs the priest of Amphiaraos to be present at the shrine from the end of winter until the summer ploughing.<sup>13</sup> This is an indication, almost certainly, that the shrine was more frequented in this period, perhaps because travel was easier. Not simply the presence of the guardian of the shrine was required but also that of the priest. Some healing sanctuaries, however, had festivals, distinct from their role as places of healing, and pilgrims were invited to attend these. Panhellenic festivals in honour of Asklepios are attested at Epidauros, Pergamon and Kos, and, while other Asklepiad festivals are known,<sup>14</sup> these three are the important ones. Like all Greek festivals, these involved processions, sacrifices and contests. In Plato's *Ion*, Ion relates to Socrates that he has just returned from Epidauros, where rhapsodic and other musical contests were held.<sup>15</sup>

#### Days for consultation of the Delphic oracle

The Delphic oracle could not be consulted at any time, and there were special days set aside for the purpose, on which alone it was permitted to consult the oracle. Ordinary pilgrims would have had no choice but to await these, and may have planned their arrival at Delphi to coincide with these days, though for those coming long distances any sort of forward planning may have been difficult. Presumably, however, that there was one specific day for consultation a month was fairly well known. According to tradition, consultations had taken place during the month of Bysios. It was in this month on only the seventh day, Apollo's birthday,

that the oracle could be consulted. Plutarch states that 'recently', presumably by classical times, the consultations had been extended from one day a year to one a month, and this is confirmed by his dialogue about the oracles at Delphi, in which one of the characters refers to the god entering a mortal body once a month. However, the temporal value to be assigned to 'recently' is the subject of debate. It is also possible that the oracle was closed for the three winter months, while Apollo supposedly visited the Hyperboreans.<sup>16</sup> It has been suggested that the oracle was open on several days of the month, with direct oracular consultation on one day, and consultation by the lot-oracle on other days, but *if* there was a lot-oracle at Delphi it is unlikely that these consultations took place on a different day from direct, verbal prophecy, and the priestess would have been responsible for both. The ancient evidence is quite explicit: the priestess was available only on one day a month for consultation.<sup>17</sup> However, there might be so many consultants that more than one Pythia would need to be employed on a 'roster' basis.<sup>18</sup>

Alexander the Great was no ordinary inquirer, however, and when he came to Delphi to consult the Pythia on a day marked as inauspicious, and the priestess did not wish to take her place on the tripod, citing the Delphic law which forbade consultation on such a day, he himself dragged her by force towards the temple, at which she cried out that he was 'invincible'. The precise meaning of what Plutarch means by 'inauspicious' days is uncertain, but if the Pythia could only be consulted once a month, then all other days were probably inauspicious, as the god would not have been present on these.<sup>19</sup> A similar incident seems to have taken place some twenty years prior to Alexander's visit. Diodoros narrates that in 355/4 Philomelos, after capturing Delphi and looting the treasures there, decided to consult the oracle about his war against the Boeotians, and compelled the Pythia to mount the tripod and to give him an oracle about the war.<sup>20</sup>

Not only were there days when the consultation of the oracle was forbidden, but if the sacrificial victim which was customarily sacrificed prior to any consultation in order to determine if the god was willing to communicate his message to the priestess would not respond, the consultation was not supposed to go ahead.<sup>21</sup>

If the consultants arrived at the right time of the month, they could seek the advice of the Pythia. For this they would need to be accompanied by a proxenos, and to pay for the pelanos (sacred

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

cake) and sacrifice a goat. Each pilgrim wishing to put a question to the priestess had to be accompanied by a native Delphian, who was the proxenos of the inquirer's native city.<sup>22</sup> Presumably all major states had such a proxenos, though it is possible that occasionally inquirers would come from obscure Greek cities and not have a proxenos. In one inscription honouring the Sardinians, the city of Delphi appointed itself as proxenos for the city of the Sardinians: clearly the latter did not have a proxenos at this time, and the Delphians promised that their city would carry out the preliminary sacrifice for the Sardinians when these came to consult the oracle. Presumably some official would be delegated this task,<sup>23</sup> as clearly the Sardinians had no personal links with the city.

In the case of other cities without a proxenos, an approach to the temple authorities would no doubt have remedied any such deficiency. That the Delphians kept a record of who the proxenoi were is indicated by a surviving inscription, which is a long list dating to the second century BC, recording the names of the Delphians who were the proxenoi for various states, both within and outside Greece, and including Rome; similar lists would have been kept in earlier and later periods as well, and this list indicates that there was official scrutiny of the identity of proxenoi.<sup>24</sup>

As the times at which the god Apollo could be consulted were infrequent, several inquirers could be expected to be waiting to make inquiries on the day reserved for consultation. The order in which they were to enter the temple and put their question to the Pythia was decided by the use of lots. Aeschylus in the *Eumenides* has the priestess say: 'Let them enter in turn according to lot, as decreed. For as the god leads, so I prophesy.'<sup>25</sup> There was also the institution of the promanteia,<sup>26</sup> by which the Delphians granted to either individuals or communities the right of consulting the oracle first, before other pilgrims. Demosthenes complained that Athens had been deprived of her promanteia at Delphi.<sup>27</sup> When there were several parties with this right of promanteia who wished to consult the oracle, then presumably the lot would be used to establish the order of consultation. Alternatively, when there were clear differences in status between consultants with promanteia, the authorities might have determined the order by reference to the degree of importance of consultants, and this might also have been the case for important consultants without the privilege of promanteia. The privilege of promanteia could be awarded as a mark of honour,<sup>28</sup> the most famous grant being that for the Chians.



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

It is inscribed with the words 'The Delphians gave the Chians *promanteia*' on the south-east corner of the altar of the Chians, which is immediately in front of the temple of Apollo itself, where even the modern visitor can see it.

#### Preliminary initiation for the Eleusinian Mysteries?

Participation in a pilgrimage event might require more than the pilgrim's presence at the rite itself. Initiation at Eleusis may have been denied unless the pilgrim had previously been initiated in the Lesser Mysteries, though this point is by no means certain. Initiation into the mysteries took place in two stages, at the Lesser and at the Greater Mysteries. The first stage at the Lesser Mysteries (in the month *Anthesterion*) was only a preparation for initiation into the Greater Mysteries (in *Boedromion*), and no tangible benefits seem to have accrued from participation in the Lesser Mysteries unless this was followed by actual initiation at the Greater Mysteries. The Lesser Mysteries clearly stood in a relationship of purificatory preparation for the Greater Mysteries.<sup>29</sup> After initiation at the Greater Mysteries, an initiate could seek a higher degree of initiation at a subsequent celebration, being able to participate in the *epopteia* and become an *epoptes*, but this was not a compulsory stage.<sup>30</sup>

Demetrios, *Poliorketes* arriving in Athens as its liberator in 307/6, wished to be initiated and to pass through all levels of initiation. To accommodate him, the Lesser Mysteries, which had already taken place, were repeated by renaming the current month *Anthesterion*. This need not be taken as evidence for the compulsory nature of the Lesser Mysteries, but at least indicates that Demetrios thought that participation in the Lesser Mysteries would enhance his initiation at the Greater Mysteries.<sup>31</sup> A scholiast, however, records that participation in the Lesser Mysteries was compulsory, and while it has been argued that the receipts of income for the Lesser Mysteries in 408/7 were so low, when compared with those for the Greater Mysteries of the same year, that few individuals could have undergone initiation in the Lesser Mysteries, this argument is unconvincing, and the scholiast's statement should be accepted.<sup>32</sup> However, if there were large numbers of participants, then it appears that the Lesser Mysteries would be held twice, especially every fourth year when the Eleusinian festival, which included athletic contests, took place.<sup>33</sup> This double celebration

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

would seem to strengthen the argument that the Lesser Mysteries may have been a compulsory preliminary for initiation into the Greater.

It is usually held that each mystes at the Greater Mysteries had his or her own individual *mystagogos* – *mystes* leader – who would be responsible for them throughout the celebration of the mysteries, but the evidence for one *mystagogos* for each individual *mystes* comes from a restored inscription which has been taken as providing for individual *myesis* with a penalty if group *myesis* occurred. However, it is possible to read the text as having no reference to individual initiation, and there is no other evidence suggesting that a *mystagogos* could only initiate one *mystes*.<sup>34</sup>

That the Athenians annually sent out *spondophoroi* for the Lesser Mysteries, admittedly not a great expense, indicates that there was an expectation on the part of the cult authorities that non-Athenians would attend the Lesser Mysteries. The sacred truce was proclaimed for the Lesser Mysteries just as it was for the Greater. Of course, if the Lesser Mysteries were not compulsory, participation by pilgrims in the Eleusinian Mysteries would have been easier, for instead of coming to Athens twice, or staying at Athens from the period of the Lesser Mysteries until the Greater almost seven months later, pilgrims need only have come once and stayed for a short time. If the Lesser Mysteries were a prerequisite for initiation in the Greater Mysteries, then pilgrims wishing to be initiated would need to have attended both ceremonies, and it can be assumed that pilgrims would have travelled to Athens for the first stage, returned home, and travelled back to Athens for the Greater Mysteries. Though inconvenient, those who genuinely wished to become initiated and to benefit from the experience would presumably have been willing to undertake the two journeys. It is also possible (though there is no specific reference to this) that the pilgrims could become initiated in the Lesser Mysteries in one year and return for the Greater Mysteries several years later, if this was more convenient than travelling to Athens twice in one year.

#### SACRIFICE AND OTHER PRELIMINARY RITES AT HEALING SANCTUARIES

Sacrifice was essential in all cults, and was generally the central feature of a religious rite. Sacrifice was integral to the incubatory

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

procedure,<sup>35</sup> and healing sanctuaries had preliminary rites to be performed before the ill could sleep in the abaton in the hope of a cure. The cult of Asklepios depended upon visitation by the god, and in the Asklepieia sicknesses were cured by divine dreams. The procedure of incubation was a religious ritual, and pilgrims had to carry out a series of acts to ensure that they would be cured. The ritual which all the Asklepieia had in common was that of sleeping in a special chamber, the abaton, which was not the temple.<sup>36</sup> The cult regulations for the Asklepieion at Pergamon, which drew the sick from all over Asia Minor, deal with the sacrificial procedure which was to be followed. With the consultant dressed in white and wearing a wreath, an animal sacrifice would be made, then cakes decorated with olive sprigs were sacrificed to various gods; the sacrificer was commanded to put on another wreath when commencing the sacrifice of the cakes. A pig was then sacrificed on the altar to Asklepios, and 3 obols placed into the thesauros (treasury).<sup>37</sup>

At the Pergamene Asklepieion, provision was also made for those who wished to undergo a further consultation, on their own behalf or that of someone else, and this involved the sacrifice of a pig (in addition to the pig already sacrificed in the first consultation). In connection with this procedure, there was also a reference to a smaller incubatory chamber: whoever entered it was to make himself pure, and it is possible that this chamber was for those who wished to have a second consultation. The procedure was the same as for the initial consultation: sacrifices of cakes were to be made to the same deities, and 3 obols were to be placed into the thesauros, but in addition there were to be sacrifices of honey cakes, with oil and frankincense, and in the evening, another three cakes were to be offered, one each to Themis, Tyche and Mnemosyne. At Erythrai, those who had incubated in the shrine were to make a sacrifice to both Asklepios and Apollo.<sup>38</sup>

There is a provision requiring ritual bathing in a Pergamene cult inscription, in the context of other required observances.<sup>39</sup> Bathing was important as a preliminary rite at some Asklepieia, and is attested at the Asklepieion at the Piraeus and the Amphiarraion at Oropos.<sup>40</sup> Consultants at the oracular incubatory centre of Trophonios at Lebadeia bathed in the river Herkyna prior to the consultation.<sup>41</sup> Bathing as part of the healing process, but without a purificatory role, is, according to Parker, attested only at the cult of Podalirios in Apulia, but he notes that the archaeology of some

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

Asklepieia nevertheless suggests that water therapy was being used there from the fourth century onwards.<sup>42</sup> None of the surviving records of cures at Epidauros, however, mentions bathing as a part of the curative process.

At Oropos the deity Amphiaraos effected cures, and the method was also by incubation. Little is known of the preliminary rites, but the relevant inscriptions make clear that preliminary sacrifice was also the rule here as at Epidauros and Pergamon, and whoever wished to seek healing from the god had to offer up sacrifice; given the context, this presumably refers to pre-incubatory sacrifices. The priest, if present, was to say prayers, and put the sacred portion on the altar, and in the case of the priest's absence this was to be the responsibility of whoever was making the sacrifice.<sup>43</sup>

Pausanias, writing over 400 years after the inscriptions, adds details which, if they cannot be taken as further evidence for fourth-century practices, can at least be seen as reflecting the cult at a later date. He writes that the consultant had to enter into a state of purification, and that this was achieved through sacrifice made to all the gods who were named on the altar in front of the shrine. When this had been done, the consultant sacrificed a ram, and slept on the fleece, and waited for a dream.<sup>44</sup> These practices, then, were similar to those at Epidauros, where the official cure inscriptions record that the incubants received dreams.

The evidence of comedy can also be utilised in this context, and Aristophanes' *Wealth* provides the most detailed account of a night in the abaton. As the god of wealth, Ploutos, is blind, explaining why undeserving men have wealth, it was decided to cure him, so that he would then distribute wealth to those who deserved it.<sup>45</sup> A description of a night in the abaton follows, in which reference is made to honey cakes and preliminary sacrifices, and a comic scene presented in which the priest is shown 'doing the rounds' of the altars, gathering up the offerings for himself.<sup>46</sup>

A hymn of Isyllos notes that even at Trikka, the first temple of Asklepios, incubation was preceded by sacrifice to Apollo, suggesting that if this happened at the original Asklepieion, it occurred at all the other Asklepieia.<sup>47</sup> At Epidauros, one of the iamata mentions 'preliminary sacrifice and customary rites'.<sup>48</sup> Sacrifice, then, was a necessary prelude to incubation, and presupposed sacrificial items, such as the pigs and cakes required at Pergamon. When the pilgrim did not have the relevant items for sacrificial procedure as required by the regulations of a sacred site, there is

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

some evidence to suggest that the sacred site would make provision for such necessities. An inscription of the fourth century from Epidauros instructed the priest of Asklepios to provide grain, wood and wreaths – essential items for sacrifice – to those who came for the sacrifice without these things and each item is costed. A wreath was half an obol, as was wood for the suckling pig. The sacrifice referred to here is not specified, but it might be the preliminary sacrifice prior to incubation.<sup>49</sup>

#### RITUAL MEALS AT SANCTUARIES

Sacrifice was part of cult procedure; after it came the ritual meal. At some sacred sites, tents were erected for this purpose; at others there were buildings specifically designed for dining. The best preserved dining halls are at Corinth, with built-in dining couches, for the local cult of Demeter and Kore on Akrocorinth. At Samothrace there are the remains of dining rooms in which the *mystai* would have feasted. Other pilgrimage centres also had banqueting facilities as revealed by the material remains of the sanctuaries, such as Epidauros, Eleusis, Brauron, Isthmia, the Asklepieion at Corinth, Delos, and at the Argive Heraion. There were ‘great’ *hestiatoria*, dining halls, on the island of Tenos, as its neighbours came in numbers to celebrate the Poseidonia festival.<sup>50</sup>

Just as tents, *skenai*, could be used as accommodation by pilgrims, they could also be erected within the sanctuary for ritual meals. In Euripides’ *Ion*, set at Delphi, Ion has a tent erected, 100 feet on each side, which would make for an area of 10,000 square feet; this can be compared to the maximum size of tents at Andania, which was 30 feet on each side. Ion feasted all the Delphians in this large tent. Euripides here must be reflecting the normal arrangement for communal feasting at Delphi; the many consultants of the oracle presumably made use of such tents.<sup>51</sup> Whether the sacrifice was consumed in a tent or in a banqueting hall, there was sometimes but not always an ‘*ou phora*’ provision, that the meat was ‘not to be taken away’ but had to be consumed ‘on the spot’. In such cases, the sacrifice must have been considered in some way consecrated, and was not allowed to be taken out of the sanctuary. The cult inscription from Oropos which provides various rules for the healing cult also includes a provision that the worshippers could sacrifice whatever they wished, but the meat was to be consumed within the sanctuary.

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

At Epidauros, sacrifices 'by an Epidaurian or a stranger' were to be consumed within the sanctuary. Similar provisions are not found for other pilgrimage festivals, such as Olympia, Nemea or Eleusis, but this may simply be due to the exigencies of the evidence; however, large crowds of worshippers – in their hundreds or thousands – may have rendered these types of prohibitions impracticable.<sup>52</sup> Many such provisions are found for local sacrifices.<sup>53</sup>

#### CLOTHING REGULATIONS

Festivals attended by pilgrims sometimes had special regulations concerning clothing which the worshipper would have to observe. The clothing of participants in Asklepiad cults was regulated. The god Asklepios was described as being dressed in white, as were the suppliants seeking cure.<sup>54</sup> In general, it can be noted that wreaths were necessary at most sacred sites; for example, these could be provided at a price by the priest of Asklepios at Epidauros.<sup>55</sup> At the Asklepieion at Pergamon, the incubants were to wear wreaths during the sacrifice because it was a preliminary to incubation, and after incubation the wreath was to be left on the incubatory bed,<sup>56</sup> presumably as a thanksgiving item.

The cult of Trophonios at Lebadeia in Boeotia indicates the importance of clothing as a ritual requirement, in connection with an oracle which was probably consulted more by men than by women. Pausanias records that the worshipper who wished to consult the oracle of Trophonios underwent purification rites which included spending several days in a dwelling sacred to Daimon and Tyche, and bathing in the river Herkyna. On the night of the consultation the inquirer sacrificed a ram; if the entrails were propitious, the consultant bathed in the river. He then worshipped and prayed to an image which the priests showed only to those who were going to consult the oracle. Then, dressed in a linen garment which was tied with ribbons and wearing boots that were made locally, he descended into a chasm in the earth. Pausanias had himself consulted the oracle, but provides no information as to why this particular form of dress was necessary. No one who had made the descent to consult Trophonios had been killed during the consultation, according to Pausanias, except for one of the bodyguards of Demetrios Poliorketes who did not carry out any of the rituals prescribed for those who wished to consult the god, but went in the hope of stealing silver and gold. As punish-

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

ment, the body of the man was cast out lifeless from the cave, but not at the point where the consultants usually emerged, that is, not at the sacred mouth of the cave.<sup>57</sup> It is quite possible that this occurred, for the cave would have been very dark with many subterranean passages, and it is clear that the consultants did not make their way out of the cave unassisted, but needed the guidance of the priests. It is probable that the bodyguard became lost, and died in the cave, but the story as related indicates the very real importance of observing correct ritual procedures.

Pausanias describes some of the difficulties involved in descending into this subterranean shrine, for after lying on his back on the ground, while holding his offerings, the worshipper had to descend feet first into a cavernous hole, and the return also had to be made through the same crevice, once again, feet first, a unique rite.<sup>58</sup> Possibly there was a practical need for special boots, stouter than ordinary walking shoes, for those who were to undergo this experience successfully, and this explains the need for the boots, made locally by a cobbler with this express purpose in mind. This, however, does not explain the cultic significance of the tunic and ribbons and, as in the Andanian mysteries, which will be discussed in the context of regulations concerning women, no reason is given for the special clothing. A regulation of the shrine of Alektrona at Ialysos, on Rhodes, prohibits the wearing of shoes or anything made of pigskin, providing further evidence for the regulation of footwear in cult ceremonies.<sup>59</sup>

Clothing was clearly an important aspect of ritual worship, not only from the authorities' point of view but also from that of the person participating in a festival, and in this context it is interesting to note that it was customary for initiates at the Eleusinian Mysteries to dedicate the clothing in which they had been initiated to the gods.<sup>60</sup> Of the various regulations in pilgrimage cults, some would not require foreknowledge, such as the exact nature of sacrificial procedure, but some regulations would be better known in advance, such as the type of clothing to wear in the case of the Andanian Mysteries. It is possible that pilgrims knew before reaching Andania that there were special clothing requirements. There would have been the word of mouth reports of those in their locality who had already been initiated, and whom the pilgrim, before setting out, may have been able to consult: the rites at Andania were especially favoured by Messenians, so particularly in that area there would be many initiates who could provide

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

advice on this. In the case of Andania, the presence of daughters indicates that children were brought by their parents to be initiated, and since some of these parents might already have been initiated into the cult they would have been aware of these rules about clothing.

But what of the pilgrim who arrived unaware that these regulations applied? The provisions for a market in the Andanian inscription tend to suggest that it was possible, for those who came unprepared, to purchase the requisite clothing in the locality, and entrepreneurs would have been prepared for this possibility. The shoes worn by women in the Andanian Mysteries had to be made from the felt or the hide of an animal which had been sacrificed. Whether it had to be sacrificed in this cult is not made clear, but even if not it is probable that there would have been at least some pilgrims who would not have been prepared for this requirement. The provision of a market-place in which 'everything might be sold', like, presumably, the local boots which were necessary to consult the oracle of Trophonios, must have been of use here.<sup>61</sup>

#### PROSCRIBED FOODS

Pilgrims might also have to avoid certain foodstuffs. At Pergamon, those visiting the shrine of Asklepios in search of a cure were required to observe one day's abstinence from goat cheese and goat meat.<sup>62</sup> This is explained by the fact that goats were not sacrificed to Asklepios, except at Cyrene.<sup>63</sup> No longer can it be claimed of Asklepieia that there is 'no evidence that the suppliants refrained from certain food... as they did in the sanctuaries of other gods'.<sup>64</sup> In the cult of Trophonios several types of fish were banned,<sup>65</sup> and in the cult of Amphiaraos at Oropos worshippers had to abstain from food for a day beforehand, and from wine for three days as the message of the god was considered to be obscured by alcohol.<sup>66</sup> In the healing cult at Acharaka, the sick could be left in the healing caves for several days without food.<sup>67</sup> At Eleusis, the initiates seem not to have eaten red mullet.<sup>68</sup> The pilgrims did not drink wine for a part of the Eleusinian Mysteries, in imitation of Demeter, who in her anguish over the missing Persephone was said to have abstained from wine.<sup>69</sup> But wine was clearly permissible during some stage in the mysteries, for Chabrias made his distribution of wine for his naval victory at Naxos on the second



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

day of the festival, Boedromion 16,<sup>70</sup> indicating that wine-drinking was permissible on the 16th.

#### EXCLUSION OF NON-GREEK SPEAKERS

The linguistic skills of the worshipper would also be taken into account at certain sanctuaries. The Greek world was surrounded by barbaroi (non-Greek speakers), who were excluded from some of the pilgrimage sites and their religious activities. Oracular sites falling into this category were those of the deity Trophonios at Lebadeia and the Amphiaraion at Thebes. The experiences of Mys, a Carian, as related by Herodotos, highlight the difficulties faced by non-Greek pilgrims. Mys had been instructed by Mardonios, the Persian commander, while wintering in Thessaly, to consult those oracles 'which he was able to consult'. Mys visited Lebadeia where he had to pay a man to enter the cave of Trophonios. This is presumably because, as a non-Greek, he was not able to do so on his own account. The oracle at Abai in Phokis, and that of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes, a temple at which oracles were sought by means of sacrifices, seem to have been consulted personally by Mys, for Herodotos does not record that in these places he had to resort to a substitute. Mys also paid someone (a non-Theban) to spend the night in the temple of Amphiaraos at Thebes, where oracles were supplied by means of dreams. Through the medium of the priestess, according to Herodotos, Amphiaraos had once given the Thebans two choices: they could consult him as a prophet, or as an ally in war. The Thebans chose the latter; so no Theban was allowed to sleep at night in the temple for the purposes of obtaining a dream oracle.<sup>71</sup>

Mys also consulted the oracle of Apollo Ptoios near Akraiphia in Boeotia; here he was accompanied by three Thebans who were to take down the words of the oracle as given by the prophetes. The prophetes astonished the three Thebans by delivering his oracles in Carian, and Mys had to snatch their tablet from them and write down the oracle himself.<sup>72</sup> It is possible that at the oracles where the god appeared to the consultant, as in the cult of Trophonios and Amphiaraos, the foreigner was forbidden, but not where the god manifested himself through the medium of a priest or priestess. This difference was in the nature of oracular inspiration: the active, where the god appeared to the consultant, and the passive, where the god made his will known through a prophet,

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

while the inquirer stood by. When the god himself appeared, it was only to Greeks; non-Greeks were prohibited from those shrines where the god made a direct appearance.<sup>73</sup> In this case the god is obviously multi-ethnic and multilingual, to the surprise of the Thebans. Delphi can also be cited as an example which could be consulted by Greeks and non-Greeks, but the questions had to be in Greek; here it was the priestess who was the mouthpiece of the god.

The most important example of exclusion based on linguistic ability is that of the Eleusinian Mysteries, from which the non-Greek speaker was debarred. The mysteries involved verbal explanations by the hierophant, which had to be understood for the worshipper to be initiated: it was not only the sense and content of the words that was important but the fact that they also had to be heard at first-hand. An individual, who had a dream that he was being initiated, was not considered to be so, as he had not clearly heard the words spoken by the hierophant.<sup>74</sup> It might also have been that the common language was an important aspect of the religious solidarity of the group gathering, and according to Herodotos it was their religion and language that gave the Greeks their ethnicity.<sup>75</sup> In the Roman period, Greek-speaking Romans could be initiated: according to Suetonius, the emperor Nero during his tour of the province in AD 60 decided not to be initiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries, knowing that at the beginning of the ceremonies a herald warned off those who had committed crimes, presumably considering that his act of matricide excluded him on these grounds.<sup>76</sup>

Competitions at panhellenic festivals were also for Greeks only. Just as at Eleusis those who could not speak Greek were not allowed to participate, Herodotos writes that when Alexander I of Macedon wanted to compete in the Olympics the competitors attempted to exclude him on the grounds that he was not a Greek. But he was able to show that he had Argive ancestry, and he competed in and won the stade. That there was a relaxation of the rule in Alexander's case is a misinterpretation: he was not a non-Greek allowed to participate, but was allowed to participate when he had shown that he was an Argive.<sup>77</sup> This law was considerably relaxed over the centuries, and Romans competed there, most notably Nero, while his predecessor Tiberius, in 4 BC, before he was emperor, entered a chariot. Romans, however, were allowed to compete at the Isthmia as early as 228 BC, and Gardiner argues

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

that this was the reason why Flamininus proclaimed the liberty of the Greeks there and not at Olympia.<sup>78</sup>

#### THE EXPENSES OF PILGRIMAGE

There were many expenses associated with pilgrimage: some of these arose directly from participation in the religious activity which was at the centre of the pilgrimage. Each sanctuary had various charges which would be levied upon worshippers and failure to make this payment would result in the worshipper being denied access to the sanctuary. All cults involved some type of sacrifice: if the beasts were provided by the sanctuary, then it sought reimbursement. Healing sanctuaries charged for sleeping in the abaton, oracular centres for the consultation of the oracle, and sites which involved initiation ceremonies charged for participation. The philosophy of levying such charges was simple. In the case of sacrificial animals, wood for the sacrifice, or wreaths for the pilgrims, it was a case of providing items which were required by the cult. Other charges were levied to provide funds for the upkeep of the shrine. In most cases, the worshippers did not pay the priests a direct fee (the main exception would seem to be the Eleusinian Mysteries); their perquisites were the skin and joints of sacrificed animals.

Consultation of Asklepios involved preliminary sacrifice and the payment of a consultation fee. It has been claimed that Oropos where Amphiaraos effected cures was unique among healing sanctuaries in charging fees for those who wished to be healed,<sup>79</sup> but in fact, while the evidence is limited, this was not the case. The sacred law for the Pergamene Asklepieion relates that the procedure for incubation required preliminary sacrifice and a payment of 3 obols, to be placed in the cult treasury.<sup>80</sup> De Waele noted that eleven bronze coins, predating the Roman sack of Corinth in 146 BC, were found in the offertory box in the Asklepieion at Corinth when he excavated it; these will presumably have been for payments of incubatory fees. At the Amphiaraion at Oropos there was an offertory box into which the incubants were to place the incubatory fee in the presence of the neokoros.<sup>81</sup>

The two fourth-century inscriptions from Oropos provide information about fees for pilgrims who sought cures there. One of the inscriptions stipulated a charge of 1 Boeotian drachma for consulting the healing deity Amphiaraos in the presence of the

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

priest, while the other also mentions a fee prescribed for whoever sought a remedy. This second decree is almost certainly later than the first one as in the second decree the price has been erased and a new price inscribed over it. The new cost was 9 obols; the original price, which was erased, was probably 6. The fee, therefore, had gone up. Pilgrims also had to pay for the consultation of oracles, as for example in a decree of the fourth century from Lebadeia which provided for a fee of 10 drachmas for whoever went down to consult the god.<sup>82</sup>

Similarly, there was a fee for consulting the Delphic oracle. A sacrifice in the form of a *pelanos*, a ritual cake, was part of the cost, and the necessity for the inquirer of either sex to 'sacrifice' the *pelanos* is clear. In Euripides' *Ion*, Ion tells the servant women that it is possible to enter the temple to consult the god if they have sacrificed the *pelanos*.<sup>83</sup> A fifth-century inscription records an agreement between the people of Phaselis and the Delphians on the subject of charges for consultation of the Delphic oracle. Whenever the state of Phaselis consults the oracle it is to pay 7 drachmas and 2 obols for the *pelanos*; if individuals make a consultation they are to pay 4 obols for the *pelanos*.<sup>84</sup> The amounts in the inscription are not round sums, and it seems that this is because the cost has been converted from another currency, probably Athenian: 7 drachmas, 2 obols of Delphic currency, the cost of a consultation by the state, would be equivalent to 10 Attic drachmas, while the fee for private consultations, 4 Delphic obols, was the equivalent of a little less than an Attic drachma. It would have been convenient had the consultation fee been fixed in an international currency: 10 Attic drachmas for a public, and 1 for a private consultation, and the charges were set in Attic, it has been suggested, in order to make clear the exact cost of consultation.<sup>85</sup> The inscription lays down the charge presumably not only for the Phaselites, but also for consultants from elsewhere throughout the Greek world. The charge for oracles at the shrine of Amphilochos (Cilicia) was 2 obols: a private consultation at Delphi was therefore twice as expensive, reflecting the prestige of this oracular centre.<sup>86</sup>

There is, however, a fourth-century agreement between the island of Skiathos and Delphi, in which the Skiathians were to be exempt from all charges except for the *pelanos*: the state of Skiathos was to be charged 2 drachmas for a consultation, while private consultants from Skiathos were to pay 2 obols, much less than the

Phaselites.<sup>87</sup> Two possible explanations for the discrepancy have been advanced: that the business of the oracle might have been declining at the time when the agreement was struck, or perhaps that the economic condition of Skiathos might have been taken into account, Phaselis being wealthy, Skiathos poor.<sup>88</sup> Perhaps charges for other states were matters for individual agreements or fell between the amounts charged for these two states.

After the sacrifice of the pelanos there followed the sacrifice of a goat in the temple.<sup>89</sup> Consultation of the Pythia would have been restricted to individuals who could purchase a beast, and to communities which would use state funds to pay for the sacrificial animal. The god Apollo himself had promised the Delphians 'rich pickings' from the sacrifices made at Delphi, and they had first choice of the meat from any sacrifice.<sup>90</sup> The quip of Callimachus is instructive in this context: 'Like flies around a goatherd or like Delphians at a sacrifice.'<sup>91</sup>

At Eleusis, fees for initiation were charged. In the Eleusinian accounts an initiation of two slaves cost 30 drachmas. This initiation took place in the month of Anthesterion, and could thus plausibly be connected with the Lesser Mysteries held at Agrai in that month, but is usually taken to refer to the Greater Mysteries.<sup>92</sup> If this were the cost of the Lesser Mysteries, presumably that for the Greater Mysteries was equivalent if not greater. The pig sacrificed as part of the Greater Mysteries would be an expense to be borne by the initiate; it has been suggested that the pig was provided by the state out of the initiation fee,<sup>93</sup> but there is no evidence for this claim. Trygaios' request for a loan of 3 drachmas in order to buy a pig so that he might be initiated seems to vitiate the suggestion.<sup>94</sup> Initiates had to pay various cult personnel certain amounts for each day of the mysteries celebrated at Eleusis: a cult inscription provides some information about the cost of initiation for the Greater Mysteries, but it is fragmentary and does not mention the hierophant and the torch-bearer, but these presumably did receive money from the initiates. The priestess of Demeter and Kore (Persephone) received an obol a day from each initiate and the hieropoioi half an obol a day, and various other cult personnel, including the priest of the altar, the cleanser of the two goddesses and a priest whose title is lost, also received fees from each initiate. The Eumolpidae and Kerykes received a sum from each initiate, 5 obols from men and 3 from women. These expenses alone would have amounted to a considerable sum.<sup>95</sup>

## CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

### THANKING THE GODS

In addition to such cult charges there was in some cases the need to make a thanksgiving offering, after the main purpose of the visit to the sanctuary had been accomplished, and it was at healing sanctuaries that such offerings were most frequently made. Many of the dedications at other sanctuaries, such as at Delphi, arose not out of a successful visit to the oracle, but represented dedications promised for success in certain fields, hence the many dedications of the equipment of defeated foes at Olympia and Delphi. At healing sanctuaries, thanksgiving offerings need not have been strictly compulsory, but they were clearly expected by the religious personnel and didactic warnings made clear the risks involved in not giving an offering.

At the Asklepieia at Epidauros and Lebena in Crete, the priests had the various individual cures (*iamata*) recorded on stone: some of these were apparently copied from dedications which had been inscribed by the grateful (and cured) suppliant. At some Asklepieia, particularly at Corinth, no *iamata* have been discovered and this almost certainly means that none were inscribed there. The patients there have left behind testimonies of a different type in the form of votive offerings, usually in terracotta, representing that part of the body which the god had cured. At Athens and Oropos there are inscribed lists of votive offerings made in the form of body parts.<sup>96</sup>

Such votive offerings do not appear to have been generally dedicated at Epidauros. The only examples at Epidauros are two in number and are from the imperial period,<sup>97</sup> and at Kos, which attracted the ill from all over the Aegean, there are also no votive offerings in this form. At Epidauros, Kos and Lebena the desire to thank the god for a cure (or rather the gods, for Apollo was not forgotten) took the form, not of models of relevant body parts, but of dedications usually connected with the cured illness or the solved problem, such as bandages, a rock, dice, a silver pig, or a goblet.<sup>98</sup> Some of the thanksgivings were pinakes, tablets, inscribed with a record of the cure. These pinakes, along with oral versions of cures, were later compiled into lists of cures, the *iamata*, at Epidauros and Lebena.

One woman Kleo, cured of a lengthy pregnancy, wrote on her anathema, offering, that while the pinax – tablet – was not great the god who had cured her was.<sup>99</sup> This seems to mean that the

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

pinax was in effect her offering to the god, a testimony to the god's healing power, and so a thank-offering to Asklepios. That readers of the dedication are asked not to marvel at the pinax but at the greatness of the god might in fact suggest it was itself an admirable object, and that Kleo had thanked the god with a costly dedication. It was obviously thought important to thank the god, or he might be angry and behave in a vindictive fashion. At Epidauros the *iamata* recorded examples of this, in order to warn those who might otherwise break their agreement with the god. One of the cure inscriptions at Epidauros records that Hermon of Thasos had his blindness cured by the god, but as he did not make a thank-offering to the god Asklepios made him blind again. Coming back to the shrine, Hermon incubated for a second time, and was made well,<sup>100</sup> and presumably after the second cure he was sensible enough to make a suitable offering.

In another case, the failure to pay a vowed offering met the full force of the wrath of the god. Pandaros, cured of his scars, returned home and gave money to another scarred individual, Echedoros, to give to the god at Epidauros. At Epidauros, Echedoros failed to do so and the god punished him not only by not curing him but by giving him the scars of Pandaros in addition to his existing ones.<sup>101</sup> In a second story along similar lines, Amphinastos, a fish carrier, while carrying his fish to Arcadia vowed to give one-tenth of the proceeds of the sale to Asklepios when the fish were sold. He did not fulfil his vow and while selling fish at Tegea the fish suddenly attacked him. A large crowd gathered at this spectacle, and the fish-monger confessed his deceit. He entreated the god to relieve him of the attacks; Asklepios made many fish appear, and Amphinastos dedicated a tenth of the proceeds to the god.<sup>102</sup> It is possible that Amphinastos had been passing through Epidauros, incubated, made his vow, and then failed to fulfil it.

In the *iamata* the god is represented as requesting thanksgiving offerings personally, as in the case of Sostrata of Pherai, who was cured after leaving Epidauros: Asklepios ordered her to send thanksgivings there. Ambrosia, who had scoffed at the god, and then been cured, as a penalty for her scepticism was commanded by the god in her dream to dedicate a silver pig.<sup>103</sup>

In one case, not the god but the temple servant made the request, and was the agent responsible for the cure. A dumb boy came as a suppliant in the care of his father. After he had performed the preliminary sacrifices and performed the usual rites, the temple

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

servant looking at the father of the boy requested that if he received 'that for which he came', he should make a thank-offering within the year. Before the father could reply, the boy suddenly said 'I promise'. His father, startled, asked him to speak again, and the boy repeated it; after this he became well.<sup>104</sup> This iama introduces the question of those who came without the necessary means to make an offering, but who presumably intended to dedicate one later. The period of one year recurs in the Pergamene cult inscription which sets out the procedure for incubation and states that those who have made pledges to the god are to pay these within a year.<sup>105</sup> This seems to indicate that promises would be made to this effect because pilgrims might not have the money or thank-offering at hand when they came to be cured.

In another iama, a local boy suffering from stones incubated and in a dream was asked by the god what he would give if he was cured: the lad promised ten dice, presumably his playthings, the god laughed good-naturedly, and the boy was cured. In one iama a paralytic dreamt that he was cured, and that the god ordered him to bring to the shrine as large a stone as he was able: the iama records that he brought the stone that then lay in front of the abaton.<sup>106</sup> The didactic nature of these iamata is clear: the god Asklepios expected to be appropriately thanked for the cures he worked.

One of the most popular thanksgiving offerings was a cock, which is easy to account for. Socrates' debt of a cock to Asklepios was well documented in antiquity;<sup>107</sup> the character Kynno in Herodas' fourth mime, in visiting an Asklepieion, offers a cock, regretting that her lack of means prevents the offering of a more substantial gift. The neokoros was to have the leg of the fowl, the serpent gets an offering of pelanos, and the rest of the cock is to be eaten at home.<sup>108</sup> Many of the suppliants were presumably too poor for oxen or pigs, so cocks, numerous and cheap, were vowed in return for cures. Socio-economic factors determined the value of the gift: people gave what they could afford.<sup>109</sup> It was only the avaricious man who claimed that the cock was an onerous expense. However, many clay cocks have been found at the Asklepieia at Corinth and Athens, and these were apparently substitute sacrifices, so that it seems that there were poor who could not afford even the sacrifice of a cock, or who perhaps wanted to make an offering of several cocks by means of effigies.<sup>110</sup>

One case reveals some anxiety on the part of the individual



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

paying the thanksgiving: Asklepios is reminded that he has received the debt which Akesson vowed him on behalf of his wife Demodike. If the god forgets that the vow has been paid, the tablet (on which payment of the vow is presumably recorded) is there to act as witness.<sup>111</sup> The temple at the Asklepieion at Epidauros must have been full not only of the inscribed accounts of iamata, but also of the votive offerings of thousands of pilgrims who visited the site over hundreds of years. These were, of course, as effective as the iamata in testifying to Asklepios' cures. An inscription from the Asklepieion on Rhodes gives an idea of just how full temples could become: no one was permitted to ask to set up a votive offering in the lower section of the temenos, or in any other place where the votive offering would obstruct the progress of those walking through,<sup>112</sup> and the situation at Epidauros, Kos and Pergamon, as panhellenic healing sanctuaries, was probably the same.

Wreaths could also be a thanksgiving offering, and the wreath which was worn into the incubatory chamber, according to the direction at Pergamon, was to be left on the mattress by the incubant.<sup>113</sup> Presumably the priests gathered up these wreaths and dedicated them to Asklepios. Pausanias records that on the road from Oitylos to Thalamai there was a sanctuary of Ino where oracles were revealed in dreams. He states that it was not possible to see the statue in the temple owing to the garlands which covered it, but that 'they say' it was of bronze.<sup>114</sup> Clearly there were many incubants who donned garlands as part of the incubatory ritual and then dedicated these to the god.

At Oropos, thanksgiving took an interesting turn; near the shrine of Amphiaraos was a spring, and into this, after a successful cure, the custom was to throw silver and gold coins. This offering of money thrown into the spring might have been in addition to a thank-offering already made, and this supposition is strengthened by the consideration that the shrine did not benefit from the money thrown into the pool. There was a similar pool at the Asklepieion at Athens.<sup>115</sup>

In the so-called 'Hall of the Votive Gifts' at Samothrace, dedications from various individuals and Greek states were probably housed; Diogenes the Cynic commented that there would be more votive offerings as thanksgiving for being saved from shipwreck if more individuals had been saved.<sup>116</sup>

## DEDICATIONS FOR VICTORIES IN PANHELLENIC CONTESTS

The religious framework of competitions at the various panhellenic festivals was extremely important. The contests were held in honour of the gods, and it is significant that there are numerous examples of victors who made dedications to the gods – and goddesses – when they returned home, giving the gods the credit for their victory.<sup>117</sup> Competitors would also make vows for dedications before competing – Kleombrotos, an athlete from Sybaris, vowed a tithe of his prize, presumably awarded by his city, if he should win.<sup>118</sup> The assistance of the gods in athletic events, as in other spheres, was crucial.

Many dedications in thanks for victories in panhellenic contests were set up, for example, on the acropolis of Athens, because of its importance as the major religious site in the city. One such statue base carries the inscription that it was dedicated by Kallias, son of Hipponikos, victorious in the chariot-race, who is said by a scholiast to have had three Olympic victories.<sup>119</sup> A victor might dedicate a statue of himself, as Kallias probably did; on a larger scale, a bronze four-horse chariot could be dedicated to commemorate a victory in a chariot-race. Pronapes, an Athenian victorious at the Nemean, Isthmian and Panathenaic festivals, dedicated a four-horse chariot group on the acropolis.<sup>120</sup> A non-Athenian, Phayllos of Kroton, who was victorious three times at the Pythian contests, and had fought at Salamis on the Greek side, dedicated a statue on the Athenian acropolis.<sup>121</sup> Another victor's statue was discovered not on the acropolis but at Salamis.<sup>122</sup>

In other cities it was customary for such statues to be set up in the market-place (agora) or in sanctuaries. The fourth-century Athenian orator Lykourgos noted that unlike Athens the market-places of other Greek cities had statues of athletes.<sup>123</sup> This probably does not mean that there were no athletic statues in the Athenian agora but that in the agora at Athens there were also many statues of a non-athletic kind; Lykourgos mentions victorious generals and the tyrant-slayers.<sup>124</sup> A statue of Phoibos Apollo was dedicated by Alkmeonides, son of Alkmeon, for a victory in the chariot-race at the Panathenaia, possibly in 546, in the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoios in northern Boeotia.<sup>125</sup> While most of the dedications on the acropolis are inscribed in Attic script, of interest are the remains of five bronze lebetes (cauldrons) of the seventh century, discovered

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

on the acropolis, inscribed with Boeotian letters: the Athenians who dedicated these prizes had obviously competed at festivals in Boeotia.<sup>126</sup>

Dedicatory statues were also commonly set up at the religious site, often in the temple, where the victory had taken place. The bronze charioteer from Delphi is a well-known example.<sup>127</sup> At Isthmia, the remains of a chariot were discovered in the archaic temple, including an iron tyre, and chariot clamps and bolts, suggesting that the actual chariot which had won the victory had been dedicated in the temple.<sup>128</sup> Statues were also frequently dedicated at Olympia. Kleosthenes of Epidamnos, victorious at the sixty-sixth Olympics in 512 BC, dedicated a group of statues at Olympia, consisting of a four-horse chariot, himself and the driver. Pausanias specifically points out that Kleosthenes was the first of those who bred horses to dedicate a statue of himself at Olympia; the earlier dedication of Euagoras the Lakonian was a chariot, for example, without the figure of Euagoras.<sup>129</sup> Milon of Kroton, famous for his six Olympic victories and defeat of the Sybarites in battle, clearly dedicated a statue as he was said to have carried his own statue into the Altis, the sanctuary area.<sup>130</sup> Numerous other statues of victors in a variety of events which were dedicated at Olympia are mentioned by Pausanias.<sup>131</sup> Other panhellenic sanctuaries were not without dedications. Aristis made a dedication to Zeus at Nemea because of his four victories in the pankration at the festival there,<sup>132</sup> and Pausanias saw various statues of victors in the Isthmian contests at the Isthmian sanctuary.<sup>133</sup>

Statues were nude, just like the competitors. At Olympia, the hellanodikai seem to have awarded the right to set up a victory statue to a particular victor, so that the right to do so was part of the prize awarded to the victors, and it seems that a statue could be erected for each victory.<sup>134</sup> The individual might erect the statue, but sometimes his state bore the expense.<sup>135</sup> But there were some restrictions. At Olympia, the hellanodikai would overturn any statue that was larger than life-size; this prohibition was probably religious in character as generally only statues of the gods would have been larger than life.<sup>136</sup> Kleombrotos' dedication states that the statue of him is equal in height and thickness to Kleombrotos himself.<sup>137</sup> Many statues portrayed the victor at the moment of triumph; this, and the inscription on the statue base, recording the name of the victor and the victory or victories, which would be read out loud by the literate passer-by, eternalised the victory.<sup>138</sup>

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

Pausanias draws a distinction at Olympia between votive offerings – *anathemata* – which were statues of Zeus, and statues of athletes. He notes that while on the Athenian acropolis statues were votive offerings like everything else on the acropolis, at Olympia in the Altis only some statues were dedicated in honour of the gods, but that the statues of athletes were not dedications but part of the prize; they were set up to reward the victor rather than honour a god.<sup>139</sup> But Pausanias' comments can and have been called into question.<sup>140</sup>

Equestrian statue groups, including chariot groups, were clearly dedications and employ vocabulary associated with dedication on their inscriptions.<sup>141</sup> Some, but not all, athletic statues which are inscribed do use a dedicatory formula which clearly indicated that they were dedications to Zeus.<sup>142</sup> Others without dedicatory formula could still be thought of as dedications if these athletes regarded the statue's position in the Altis as evidence enough of its status as a dedication. Of course, even statues which were dedications were also presumably intended at Olympia, as elsewhere, to be a monument to personal glory (as Pausanias notes), testifying to the athlete's victory; they could also act as indicators of the social and economic status of the dedicant.

Victors might also make small dedications of items of an athletic nature, pertaining to the victory obtained. Akmatidas the Spartan dedicated a jumping weight at Olympia, having won 'without dust', that is without a contest.<sup>143</sup> Such a small votive offering might seem purely pious in character, but nevertheless, inscribed as it is, it still served as a proclamation of an individual's victory. The reading of the inscription on a jumping weight (halter) dedicated at Isthmia is difficult, but might be: 'Kratippos won the pentathlon holding me in his hand, and he won also two times previously. He dedicated me.'<sup>144</sup> Another (lead) halter was dedicated by Epainetos at Eleusis.<sup>145</sup> Tripods were common prizes and dedications: victors in the contests of the league of Dorian cities *had* to dedicate their tripod prizes in the temple of Apollo Triopios.<sup>146</sup>

Also at Olympia there is the well-known stone of Bybon, dating to the mid-sixth century, which is a lump of sandstone, weighing 316 pounds and inscribed: 'Bybon, son of Phorys, threw me above his head, with one hand.' Weight-lifting was not an event at the Olympia; perhaps the stone related to a feat of strength performed as part of the activities which accompanied the contests, as at

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the Isthmia where there was a wide range of unofficial activities accompanying the festival.<sup>147</sup>

Musical victories also called for dedications to the gods. In the *Works and Days*, Hesiod relates how he sailed from Aulis (where the Greeks set sail for Troy) to Chalkis on Euboia; at a festival at Chalkis he won a victory with his song and was awarded a tripod, which he dedicated to the Muses of Helikon.<sup>148</sup> Pausanias, in fact, writes that the oldest tripod dedicated on Helikon was the one which Hesiod won at Chalkis on Euboia. A fragment of an inscribed dedicated archaic bronze lebes (cauldron), probably of the seventh century, has also been found at the site, indicating that dedications were made here in the archaic period.<sup>149</sup> A dance victory was the cause of one dedication.<sup>150</sup>

Many of the contests at the Panathenaia at Athens had amphorai as prizes (these are referred to as Panathenaic prize amphorai) and these were dedicated in temples and sanctuaries. These vases depicted the relevant contest, but did not give the victor's name, as they were fired well in advance. Examples have been found in the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth, that of Poseidon at the Isthmia, and that of Demeter and Persephone at Cyrene, indicating that successful competitors took them home and dedicated them in thanksgiving. Similarly, many fragments of these vases discovered on the Athenian acropolis suggest dedications to the patron of the Panathenaia, Athena.<sup>151</sup> But it can also be noted that many victors chose to have one or more vases buried with them, and that they have also been found far outside the Greek world.

By making dedications in sanctuaries and temples for equestrian, athletic and musical victories, victors proclaimed that the gods were responsible for their victories, and this underlines the religious character of the contests from the Greek point of view. Victors – equestrian, athletic and musical – obviously felt that it was very important to thank the gods, for contests were part of religious ceremonies and were not secular events.

#### PILGRIMAGE BY PROXY

Sacred regulations need not even require that the pilgrim be the one in need of the gods' assistance. This is most clearly the case with Delphi, where consultation by proxy was common; individuals could send others on their behalf to receive an oracle. This

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

was the method employed by monarchs and states, who would of course send representatives to receive the oracle on their behalf. Croesus sent envoys to receive an oracle, and this was delivered openly to them. A late source, however, records that a response could be received under seal by an inquirer, and it has been suggested that this is an indication that the inquirer was seeking an oracle for someone else.<sup>152</sup> Presumably, in this case, the proxy was not present at the consultation with the Pythia, and the priests would have written down the oracle for the purposes of secrecy.

Even at healing sanctuaries if sick individuals could not be present, someone else could incubate on their behalf. The proxy had to carry out the same rituals as the sick person would have performed. One of the *iamata* from Epidauros records how a mother incubated at Epidauros on behalf of her daughter who stayed in Lakonia, and was cured there. Similarly, at Pergamon, it was possible to incubate in place of another person.<sup>153</sup>

#### ‘LOCKED IN A GOLDEN SILENCE’

Mystery cults differed from other religious events in that the worshippers involved were not permitted to reveal their experiences. The mystery celebrations as a whole were in direct opposition to the rest of Greek religious practice, which was open and quite public. Aspects of Greek worship in general were overt in their performance and the evidence of worship, such as dedications of clothing, armour, shields and helmets, votive offerings, and cult images such as herms, were displayed where all could see them: there was nothing in Greek belief similar to the Christian injunction against deliberate displays of public piety designed to capture the attention and admiration of others.<sup>154</sup> But knowledge of the mystery celebrations at Eleusis was to be revealed only to those being initiated, and therefore pilgrims attending these mysteries were forbidden to disclose their experiences. While the activities of other pilgrims would have been the subject of detailed discussion on their return home, this would not have been the case for the pilgrims to Eleusis, or other secret mystery celebrations, such as at Andania, Samothrace or Lykosoura, and it may be assumed that this may in itself have been one of the attractions of participation.

Despite this prohibition, evidence concerning the Eleusinian Mysteries is available, but should be treated with caution. The

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

secrecy of the rite is in itself well documented. The *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* contains the first references in literature to the mysteries: 'no one may in any way transgress or pry into or utter' anything about them.<sup>155</sup> According to Sophocles, the mysteries were 'locked in a golden silence', while in Aristophanes' *Frogs*, silence is imposed on the *mystai* who feature prominently in the underworld.<sup>156</sup> Pausanias in describing Eleusis is prevented from writing about what was inside the sanctuary wall as a dream holds him back, 'and what the uninitiated are not permitted to see they are of course not to learn about'. Another dream prevented him from discussing the Eleusinion at Athens, while elsewhere he begs the reader's forgiveness for failing to reveal the nature of the mysteries of Demeter and Kore in Boeotia.<sup>157</sup> According to Aelian, a curious individual who climbed up a rock to see over the walls of the Eleusinian sanctuary in order to find out what happened in the celebrations fell off and died. Asklepios was more sympathetic in a similar case.<sup>158</sup> Entrance into the *anaktoron* at Eleusis was permissible only to the hierophant and a non-hierophant who entered died soon afterwards.<sup>159</sup>

Diagoras of Melos in the fifth century trivialised the mysteries by telling people about them, and by doing so dissuaded people from being initiated, and as a consequence, he was sentenced to death. There was a reward, of 1 talent, for the person who killed Diagoras, and, the scholiasts add, 2 talents if he was brought in alive.<sup>160</sup> The parodying of the mysteries, the performance of mock mystery celebrations outside of their sacred context at Eleusis, was a crime against religious belief, a case of *asebeia*. When several persons were tried by jury for their participation in the parody of the mysteries in 415, only initiates were allowed in the court. This exclusiveness implies the seriousness with which the offence was regarded, the number of initiates who were available for jury service, and the fact that the initiates could be readily determined.<sup>161</sup> Alkibiades' political career suffered, his property was confiscated, and he was condemned to death because of the allegation that he and his companions parodied the mysteries at a dinner party.<sup>162</sup> The orator Andocides in 400 had to defend himself against the charge that he had no right to attend the Eleusinian Mysteries because he lay under a ban for his part in this profanation of the mysteries in 415. Under the decree of Isotimides passed in the wake of the scandal of the profanation, all those guilty of impiety were debarred from entering temples or the

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

Athenian agora.<sup>163</sup> Lucian records that Demonax was accused of being the only Athenian not to be initiated in the mysteries, but that he justified this by stating that if he were to be initiated and found the mysteries to be trivial, he would not be able to keep silent before the uninitiated, while if they were beneficial he would have to let everyone know about them, as befitted a philanthropist. In the Roman period, Horace refused to travel on board the same ship as someone who had parodied the mysteries, believing that the ship was bound to come to grief.<sup>164</sup>

In the case of cults involving mystery celebrations, the worshipper could only enter the sanctuary if she or he was initiated in the cult of the sanctuary or was undergoing initiation, and Eleusis was such a case. Livy records the story that two Akarnanian youths from Aetolia who were not initiated had entered the temple of Ceres (i.e. Demeter) at Eleusis during the initiation ceremony, having merely followed the crowd, unaware of their sacrilege. They betrayed themselves by asking questions about what was going on, and although it was obvious that they had wandered in by accident they were put to death as if they had committed an 'atrocious crime'. The story need not be historical, but the implications are clear: the secrecy of the mysteries was inviolable. According to Diogenes Laertius, a certain Theodoros who asked the hierophant who were the impious in regard to the Eleusinian Mysteries received the reply that it was those who explained the mysteries to the uninitiated. 'Then you are impious,' countered Theodoros, 'as you explain them to the uninitiated.' For this untimely retort, Theodoros narrowly escaped being brought before the Areiopagos through the intervention of Demetrios of Phaleron, tyrant of Athens from 317–307, while an alternative version records that he was condemned to drink hemlock. Similarly, at Samothrace, only initiates could enter the holy place.<sup>165</sup>

The uninitiated (and women) were forbidden in a local cult on Paros. A similar restriction occurred in the Boeotian shrine of Kabeiraian Demeter and Kore near Thebes, and Pausanias records the unfortunate fate of several Persians who, uninitiated, entered the Boeotian shrine during the Second Persian War: they went mad and some drowned themselves in the sea while others threw themselves from precipices to their deaths.<sup>166</sup> The historicity of such stories is of little importance, particularly when recorded by Pausanias some 600 years after the events were supposed to have



occurred. Rather, the stories were intended to serve as a warning to the uninitiated worshipper not to enter the shrine.

Significantly, Diodoros states that the celebrations which were the object of secrecy at the mystery cults of Eleusis and Samothrace were performed publicly in Crete, but his statement is contradicted by the fact that Eleusis was the mystery centre *par excellence*, and that non-Athenians went to Athens, not Knossos.<sup>167</sup> It is important, however, to look at what Diodoros actually records, as he reports that it is the Cretans who allege that what others celebrate as mystery rites are performed publicly on Crete. The illogic is clear: if the mystery celebrations at Athens were secret, the Cretans, except for initiates sworn to secrecy, could not know that their mysteries were precisely the same, and therefore close religious similarities between Eleusis and Crete in this matter need not be assumed.

Aeschylus was accused of parodying the mysteries, a charge provoked by a stage prop in one of his plays. He argued that he did not know that what he had shown was secret: perhaps there was a thin line between what was secret and what was not, and only an initiate could, in any case, judge.<sup>168</sup> Pausanias' statement that he would not even reveal what was inside the sanctuary can be taken as an indication that he at least thought that everything within the sanctuary could be known by initiates only,<sup>169</sup> which implies that entry to the sanctuary at any time was only possible for initiates: for Pausanias at least, a description of the sanctuary was in itself a revelation of forbidden secrets. The neopythagorean Numenius dreamt that the Eleusinian goddesses, dressed as whores outside a brothel, told him that he had prostituted the Eleusinian secrets in a philosophical work.<sup>170</sup>

Burkert on the basis of the passages in Pausanias and Numenius argues that the scruples concerning the secrecy of the mysteries increased with time because the mysteries were becoming less popular.<sup>171</sup> However, it is not demonstrated that the mysteries became less popular or 'powerful' in their attraction as time went on, and the third century AD decree on the organisation of the mysteries indicates a flourishing cult.<sup>172</sup> Simply because there are references later than the fifth and fourth centuries BC to the secrecy of the cult, this is not indicative of greater scruples: as is clear from the above discussion, there are numerous examples concerning the secrecy of the cult in the archaic and classical periods.

Supporting the evidence that secrecy was required is the fact

#### CULT REGULATIONS AT SANCTUARIES

that though this secrecy was violated, it was on very rare occasions. While this may seem improbable in view of the fact that thousands attended the mysteries every year, and Eleusis operated for probably upwards of a millennium, this secrecy was possible because of the nature of the initiates. They were the pious people of Aristophanes' *Frogs*, confident in their initiation, who looked forward to a happier time in the afterlife than the dismal Hades offered by Homeric tradition. To reveal the secret of these 'awful mysteries, not in any way to be transgressed, inquired about or divulged, for great reverence of the gods checks speech' was to jeopardise this paradise, to invoke the wrath not only of the civil authorities, but, far worse, of the gods themselves.<sup>173</sup> The sources are explicit on the mystery surrounding the Eleusinian rites, and despite the thousands who witnessed and partook of the mysteries annually, scholars are unlikely ever to discover the precise nature of the cult practices.

The Eleusinian Mysteries had a fixed programme extending over several days, including several days of preparation before the main rite of initiation. In the Arcadian Mysteries at Lykosoura, several days' waiting was set down for certain classes of people, though it is unclear whether this was before they could enter the shrine or before they could be initiated: ten days for ordinary individuals (*idioi*), ten days in the case of women who had given birth, and a number of days for outsiders (*allotrioi*, the opposite of *idioi*); a reference to five days is restored, and perhaps indicates that travellers have less time to wait.<sup>174</sup>

#### CONCLUSION

Pilgrims to sacred sites clearly had various cult rituals to perform. The success of their pilgrimage depended on the observance of these rituals, and rules covered the various rites to be carried out in the cults, and procedures to be followed. Pilgrimage clearly involved expense, particularly where animal sacrifice was required, and cult fees seem to have been the norm. Didactic tales, such as those involving the bodyguard of Demetrios who is specifically said not to have followed the correct ritual procedure and who was cast out dead from the oracular cave of Trophonios, warned of the importance of cult ritual. There were also rules which could be said to be 'secular' in nature, not dealing with the ritual of the

PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

cults, and there were also many ritual laws concerning women, and these are the subjects of the next two chapters.

## THE FEMALE PILGRIM

Although there were some rites in which they were not permitted to participate, the majority of religious activities did allow for the presence of women, and sometimes for their active participation. The chorus of women in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* mentions various religious duties which they had carried out for the city-state, and Euripides points quite clearly to the important role which women played in cult. While two of the examples he gives are the oracular priestesses at Delphi and Dodona, he also mentions rites for the Fates and 'Nameless Goddesses', which were mystery celebrations only for women.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless their religious activities are generally neglected by scholars; the fact that women went on pilgrimages to sanctuaries, for example, is rarely mentioned. This affects the conception of the ancient Greek woman, and reinforces the stereotyped view that women were secluded. It is certainly true that women had no say in the politics of the day, except in the burlesque of Aristophanes' *Ekklesiazousai* (*Women in Assembly*). Yet in the sphere of religion women cannot be accurately described as secluded. They had their own festivals, from which they barred men, and which took place in secret, and sometimes at night. At these gatherings they reaffirmed their sexuality, and their role as the guardians of the community's fertility. In the sphere of festivals, women could be released from masculine control. But the festivals occurred at fixed times of the year, and the break from domestic routine was regulated through a fixed timetable. The women returned home within a respectable time. Nevertheless at certain festivals women came together and were responsible for many features of the organisation of the festival, obviously conscious of their sex and their role in promoting fertility. In contrast, there were very few

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

all-male religious cults, and while Greek men might have excluded women from political decisions, women had a definite role to play in the worship of the gods.

Pilgrimage is a religious activity which involves travel away from home, a break from normal affairs, and a time away from domestic duties. Greek women, despite other evidence for their seclusion, undertook pilgrimages, and the evidence, especially from Epidauros, Eleusis and Andania, indicates that many women, and not just a few, did so. However, the sites to which they travelled were controlled by men; even the great cults in honour of female goddesses, at Lykosoura and Andania, were organised by males, and regulated women and their behaviour from a male perspective. At Eleusis, where Demeter and Kore (Persephone) were worshipped, male religious personnel predominated. It is interesting that while women could control and organise their own festivals in their local communities, such as the Thesmophoria, this was not the case for any cult which transcended local importance. Most cults which were of more than local significance were under the control of males.

As pilgrims, women often travelled for hundreds of kilometres for religious purposes. Examples, which will be discussed in more detail below, include Andromacha making her way from Epeiros in northern Greece to Epidauros in the Peloponnese, several hundred kilometres away; Ionian women travelled with their husbands and children from Ionian cities in Asia Minor and from islands throughout the Aegean in order to honour Apollo on Delos; women called Thyiades, who participated in maenadic ritual, travelled from Athens to Delphi, performing dances along the way. Andromacha even if accompanied by male or female chaperones went on a pilgrimage for a personal motive; the Ionian women worshipped with their families; the Thyiades were on a group pilgrimage in which only they as women performed religious rites. In the lists of *mystai* from Samothrace, men predominate over women, but there are two cases where women seem to have been initiated, not as part of a group, but as separate individuals, who had presumably travelled to Samothrace on their own account.<sup>2</sup>

Several pilgrimage sites, especially healing sanctuaries, attracted female pilgrims, and women seeking to become pregnant not only sought the assistance of Asklepios at Epidauros, but could also consult Delphi about the possibility of having a child. In addition to cares arising specifically out of pregnancy and childbirth,

#### THE FEMALE PILGRIM

women went to Epidauros and Oropos with other ailments, and were initiates in mystery cults such as those at Eleusis, Andania and Lykosoura.

Many of these female pilgrims will have been from the upper socio-economic group, with the leisure to travel and the money to do so. Ambrosia who dedicated the silver piglet at Epidauros in return for an ophthalmological cure was clearly no pauper.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, the cost of pilgrimage should not be overstated: when so many people travelled on foot, had a simple diet, and slept in the open or in tents, wealth should not be considered as a prerequisite for pilgrimage. The further away the home of a pilgrim was from a pilgrimage destination, however, the greater the expense involved. The most significant expense would have been cult fees, which were not always high, though consultation at Delphi which involved animal sacrifice would not have been cheap. The social background of the women involved is difficult to determine, though in cases of pilgrimage which took place over a long distance, it should perhaps be assumed that only women from the higher socio-economic group were involved. Women presumably did not generally undertake pilgrimage by themselves, and the sick women travelling to Epidauros would have had male attendants, such as Sostrata of Pherai who was carried on a couch to the sanctuary. She was probably from Pherai in Messenia rather than Thessaly, about 150 kilometres by land, though it is likely that Sostrata took ship from a port near Pherai and went by sea to Epidauros.

The limits on the cost of clothing at Andania are so generous that it is clear that some of the women involved, or their husbands, were financially well off. Clearly the women who were initiated at Andania could come from a higher economic class, as initiates could wear a garment costing up to as much as 1 mina; 2 minas in the case of the priestesses.<sup>4</sup> One of the women who visited Epidauros in the fourth century was a royal personage, Andromacha of Epeiros, wife of Arybbas, with the hope of falling pregnant.<sup>5</sup> Another royal woman who went on pilgrimage was Olympias, future mother of Alexander the Great. She was an initiate of the Samothracian mysteries and there met Philip of Macedon, so she had at some time made the journey from Epeiros to Samothrace.<sup>6</sup>

There is little evidence for any form of age restrictions for adult women taking part in religious activities. According to Callima-

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

thus, women over 60 years of age were prohibited from attending mysteries of Demeter. Whether the Eleusinian Mysteries or simply Demetriad mysteries in general are meant here is unclear.<sup>7</sup>

As pilgrimage was a religious affair, the activities of females, like those of males who went on pilgrimage, were subject to religious regulations. At pilgrimage destinations the worshippers had to be ritually pure, and for females this was a more difficult state to attain than for males because of the male interpretation of what constituted purity. Cult laws covered clothing, food, sexual activity, breast-feeding, and contact with birth and death; apart from death, these were categories for which there were more regulations for women than for men for biological reasons.

#### WOMEN-ONLY CULTS

Certain cults were restricted to women. Only women could enter the temple of Dionysos at Bryseai (Lakonia); the same applied at the temple of Demeter, near Megalopolis, while the sanctuary of Kore at Megalopolis could be entered by women at any time, but men could only go in once a year. Women entered the Hippodameion at Olympia once a year in order to sacrifice to Hippodameia, the wife of Pelops. A seven-day festival in honour of Demeter Mysia was held at the Mysaion, near Pellana, and on the third day the men left the sanctuary, leaving the women to celebrate their customary rites that night, with the men returning on the fourth day. There are numerous examples of such women-only cults.<sup>8</sup>

As in Thesmophoria cults on the whole, the Thesmophoriac rites on Paros were only for women: Miltiades' death resulted from gangrene, which infected his leg (some said he wrenched his thigh, others that he struck his knee) after he had fallen from the sanctuary wall while running away from the shrine after wrongly attempting entry. Only women could attend a sacrifice to Dionysos and Semele at one deme festival in Attica. Apart from the gynaikonomos, who was in charge of the women, no other male could enter into the shrine where women celebrated their Bacchic rites at Methymna, and even he was excluded from the nocturnal festival.<sup>9</sup> Women were similarly excluded from a number of cults and sacrifices which were restricted to men.<sup>10</sup> Cole argues that in excluding women from participation the expressions used are 'not laid down by custom for a woman' or 'not sanctioned by

#### THE FEMALE PILGRIM

divine law for a woman', and that the one epigraphic reference to the exclusion of men from a female cult does not use such forceful religious vocabulary. She argues that the exclusion of women was expressed in 'stronger language' than the exclusion of men, and that this reflects the gender imbalance in Greek society in general.<sup>11</sup> Certainly this was the case, but male transgressions in female cult activity were taken very seriously indeed, as indicated by the story about Miltiades.

#### WOMEN AND SEXUAL PURITY

Sexual abstinence and avoidance of contact with the pollutions of childbirth and death were preoccupations which are attested in Greek religion, and were common subjects of purity regulations in Greek cults.<sup>12</sup> The sanctuary was kept apart from these impurities, and the absence of contact with the impure was also integral to the purity of the worshipper. Miasma 'catalysts' such as sexual intercourse, birth and death, were to be avoided. One inscription records that any visitors to the temple of Athena at Pergamon, either 'citizens or any others', had to observe certain procedures in order to ensure that they were pure before entering the shrine. The reference to 'others' as well as to citizens indicates that not only non-citizen residents but also pilgrims visited the sanctuary, as the Nikephoria festival celebrated at Pergamon was a penteteric, panhellenic celebration. Pilgrims at the shrine, like other visitors, were expected to observe the following restrictions. On the day of the visit to the shrine, the worshipper had to refrain from sexual intercourse with his wife, and the wife from her husband, while extra-marital sex required a full day's abstinence before the day of the visit. Visitors were not allowed to have come into contact with death or with a woman in childbirth on the day before or the day of the visit, and contact with a funeral procession and burial was not permitted on the same day. If worshippers nevertheless wished to enter the shrine, they could gain purification by making use of the 'holy-water'. The distinction that is made between marital and extra-marital intercourse is interesting, as is the longer period of purification involved in such cases.<sup>13</sup> Those wishing to incubate at the Asklepieion at Pergamon had to abstain from sex, as well as from goat's meat and cheese.<sup>14</sup>

Women, from the point of view of the Greek male, were potential sources of ritual impurity, and the physiological status of



female worshippers was of concern to authorities at some sanctuaries. The mysteries of the Despoina at Lykosoura prohibited pregnant women and breastfeeding mothers from participation. This was due to the 'logic of opposition': women about to give birth, or who were breastfeeding, were debarred from the fertility rites of the Despoina.<sup>15</sup> This and similar cases may well have been the exception to the rule, as pregnant women were otherwise expected to go to temples.<sup>16</sup> Women consulted the healing god Asklepios at Epidauros about pregnancies, but nevertheless were not permitted to give birth in the abaton, the place where the god appeared in dreams to suppliants.<sup>17</sup> Childbirth was a definite impurity, associated with blood, which tainted both the woman and all who came into contact with the birth.

The necessity for sexual purity is particularly indicated in the sleeping arrangements of those taking part in incubatory rites. At the healing shrine of Amphiaraos at Oropos, there was the provision that those who came to sleep in the koimeterion (abaton) seeking a cure were to be sexually segregated: the women were to sleep on one side of the altar, and the men were to sleep on the other.<sup>18</sup> The rule at Oropos can be explained in terms of the fact that sexual purity was a prerequisite for incubation, and that the Greeks did not approve of sexual activity in their temples. Intercourse in temples, as is obvious from these various regulations, was forbidden and, as usual, didactic tales warned of the fate of those who fornicated in temples and shrines. Herodotos states that the Greeks and the Egyptians had the same scruples in this respect and that the Egyptians were the first to observe such proprieties.<sup>19</sup>

Clauses concerning unwilling and willing pollution by a boy have been interpreted as references to wet dreams and an injunction against masturbation respectively in the Cyrene cathartic law. Semen, as a bodily emission, was considered unclean, and so a profane substance.<sup>20</sup> However, in the abaton at Epidauros a wet dream caused by a vision of a beautiful boy was the means by which one man was cured.<sup>21</sup> The sexual act, involving semen, induced miasma and led to the restrictions placed on sexual activity. This was probably not a case of foregoing something in order to offer up the deprivation as a sacrifice to the god, for there is no evidence that sexual abstinence had a 'Lental' connotation, though it is significant to note that extra-marital sex was less acceptable at the sanctuary of Athena at Pergamon. Moreover, it might well have produced a heightened state of expectation for

#### THE FEMALE PILGRIM

the cult experience, while after the ceremonies the climax of the sexual act would serve as a positive reminder of the return to the world of the profane.<sup>22</sup> The various regulations about sexual activity did not apply to all sites. Dio Chrysostom refers to a brothel-keeper taking his 'stock' to the Delphic amphictyonic gathering at Pyloi and other festivals.<sup>23</sup>

#### 'FOR THE SAKE OF OFFSPRING'<sup>24</sup>

The cure inscriptions (*iamata*) from the healing centre of Epidauros in the Peloponnese indicate that this panhellenic centre attracted women, and there are many cases in which the suppliants were female: wives, mothers, and unmarried girls. One of the main reasons why women were among the suppliants of Asklepios was because they were in quest of successful conclusions of pregnancies, like Kleo who had been pregnant for five years.<sup>25</sup> The curing process involved sleeping in the *abaton*, during which the suppliant hoped that the god would appear to her in a dream, and give advice on how to cure the specific problem or actually perform the cure. Ithmonika of Pellana had a similar problem to Kleo's; originally, she had incubated in the temple 'for the sake of offspring', and the god appeared to her in a dream in which she requested of the god that she might become pregnant, with a daughter. Asklepios promised this, and asked if she had a further request; she answered that she did not. She did not, however, give birth to the child, but experienced a three-year pregnancy. Ithmonika therefore came back to Epidauros and incubated again and the god reminded her that he had asked her if she needed anything else, and that she had said no. He would, however, grant her childbirth, although she had not asked for help with this. When Ithmonika woke she hurried out of the *abaton*, and gave birth.<sup>26</sup>

Not only Ithmonika sought the aid of Epidaurian Asklepios in order to become pregnant; Andromacha, wife of Arybbas, king of Epeiros, also incubated for this purpose. She dreamt that a handsome boy uncovered her, and that the god touched her with his hand, and subsequently she became pregnant, and bore a son.<sup>27</sup> Women's pilgrimage might have a political motivation as a royal woman, Andromacha, travelled to Epidauros in search of pregnancy clearly to have children for the sake of the dynasty (though this need not have precluded personal motives as well). In a similar

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

case to Andromacha's, the local woman of Lebena who slept in the abaton of the Asklepieion there in order to become pregnant, dreamt that Asklepios placed a sikya, a cupping instrument, on her stomach, and she conceived. The god in a dream had ordered the woman's husband, who was 50 and childless, to send his wife along to the abaton. Clearly anxiety about the husband's age and childlessness triggered this dream; if his wife was of a similar age as he (though she could easily have been much younger), concern for her approaching menopause may also have been responsible.<sup>28</sup>

Another iama records that a woman of Troizen slept in the abaton for the purpose of having offspring. The god appeared and promised her request, and asked the woman what sex of child she desired; she answered a male, and within the year he was born. But there was another way in which women desiring children became pregnant with the help of Asklepios, without personal involvement by the god, but instead by his sacred serpent. There are two examples from Epidauros, one of which involves Agameda of Keos, who slept in the abaton, and dreamt that a serpent lay on her stomach; subsequently five children were born to her. Nikasiboula of Messenia, also in quest of children, had a dream in which the god approached her, with a serpent crawling behind him, and she slept with the serpent, and from this two sons were born to her within the space of a year.<sup>29</sup>

Aristodama of Sikyon claimed that she fell pregnant with Asklepios' aid. At Sikyon, on the roof of the temple of Asklepios, there was a woman represented riding a serpent, whom the Sikyonians claimed was Aristodama, mother of Aratos, the strategos of the Achaeans in the second half of the third century, who was considered by the Sikyonians to be the son of Asklepios. In the light of the iamata which claim that the serpent of Asklepios effected pregnancies, it is possible that Aristodama had incubated, either at Sikyon or Epidauros, in the hope of falling pregnant, and that this was the origin of the tale. That Asklepios was the father could have been inspired by a dream; she, like others, might have dreamt that a serpent slept with her or that the god touched her. In this case, the serpent, given the claimed paternity of Aratos, was identified as Asklepios, with Aratos openly known as his son.<sup>30</sup>

But where the serpent healed in the absence of the god, it need not necessarily be always assumed that the serpent was an epiphany of the god, as believed by Weinreich, though of course that gods visited women in the form of snakes was a common mythical

#### THE FEMALE PILGRIM

motif.<sup>31</sup> Clearly serpents could have a phallic connotation. Serpents were also credited with other cures. In Aristophanes' *Wealth*, Ploutos' blindness is cured by the serpents licking his eyelids.<sup>32</sup> In the Epidaurian iamata, serpents cured one man's sore toe: during the day he was sleeping outside, and a serpent came and licked it, making it well.<sup>33</sup> Asklepios himself sometimes appeared as a serpent.

Women also went to Epidauros for other medical problems. Ambrosia of Athens visited Epidauros, but scoffed at the cures which were recorded there, and at the belief that the lame and blind could become better just through seeing a dream. She herself was blind in one eye. She incubated, and in her dream the god appeared and said that he would make her well, but as payment she would have to place in the shrine a silver pig as a remembrance of her ignorance.<sup>34</sup> She dedicated this piglet, which is presumably testimony to some degree of affluence. The fantastic nature of some of the records of miracle cures does not detract from the phenomenon of female pilgrimage. The accounts indicate that women were regular clients at Epidauros at least in the fourth century when the iamata were inscribed, and that the authorities of the sanctuary encouraged women to visit Epidauros.

It can be noted that of the fifty-two extant iamata at Epidauros, thirty-three of the suppliants were men, thirteen were women, and five were children, one of whom was a girl. Of the thirteen women, six came on matters related to pregnancies. This was clearly a major factor in women consulting the god at Epidauros. The sample is small, and a little less than a third of these suppliants were women, though it is possible that the male temple authorities may have selected cures undergone by males in preference to those by females when compiling the iamata. However, priests wanting to encourage all categories of sick would seek to attract women as a major category of suppliant. The iamata imply that many women did wish to consult Asklepios to become pregnant (particularly as blame for lack of children fell on the woman rather than the man). Clearly women were regular suppliants at Oropos too, and the presence of female worshippers at Lebena on Crete is well attested.<sup>35</sup>

Though these cases might have been unusual, they are nevertheless evidence that women could travel long distances on pilgrimages, and that some women went on pilgrimage in their own right. They may have been accompanied by their husbands,

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

male relatives or other chaperones, but the religious experience was their own: it was they who dreamed that the god cured them. Clearly, this was also the case at Oropos. Women would go on pilgrimage in search of a cure, but more importantly, would travel considerable distances in order to do so, coming from Messenia, Epeiros, Pellana, Keos, Athens, Sparta, Pherai, Kaphyiai and Troizen. It was probably the case that a pilgrimage in search of a cure or a pregnancy was one of the few times (along with initiation at mystery celebrations) when the women of ancient Greece travelled outside the confines of their native polis or state.

#### WOMEN AS CONSULTANTS AT DELPHI

Women also consulted oracles, though probably less frequently than they visited healing centres. Kreousa, in Euripides' *Ion*, accompanied her husband from Athens, and while he consulted the oracle of Trophonios at Lebadeia, she wandered around the sacred site with her servants. This does not mean that women could not consult the oracle, for Ion specifically asks her whether she has come 'with her husband or alone to consult the oracle?'<sup>36</sup> It is clear that the oracle was frequently consulted not merely on political matters but also on questions of harvests or childlessness, the latter being of particular relevance to women, and Ion does in fact ask Kreousa whether she has come 'about crops or children'.<sup>37</sup> The chorus of women in the play are told that they can go into the temple for a consultation if they wish, but must first provide a pelanos, and sacrifice a beast.<sup>38</sup>

Similarly, other women accompanied their husbands on such missions and the oracle was certainly consulted in an historical fourth-century incident about the possibility of the petitioner having a child: a woman, who had experienced several miscarriages, consulted the god about having a child and was assured that she would have a child. Eleven months after the consultation she did become pregnant, and again three years later, and she recorded her thanks at Delphi.<sup>39</sup> Women, in undertaking religious activities, could be active pilgrims even to the extent that they could consult the most important oracle in the Greek world, which because of the important political questions which were put to it might be thought to have been a male prerogative.

THE FEMALE PILGRIM  
THYIADES AND ORGIA

There is possibly one pilgrimage where women would not have been chaperoned by men. Little is known about an annual pilgrimage made by a group of Athenian women known as the Thyiades, but Pausanias states that in company with women from Delphi they went to Mt Parnassos above Delphi each year and celebrated secret rites (orgia) in honour of Dionysos. It is interesting to note that the Thyiades held dances along the road from Athens to Delphi, and Pausanias names one dance venue, namely, Panopeos: this place was described by Homer as 'kallichoros', a place where there were fine dancing grounds.<sup>40</sup> The pilgrimage of the Thyiades with its ritual acts throughout the journey to Delphi can be compared with the specific cult acts which took place during the procession from Athens to Eleusis, and from Miletos to Didyma. What is particularly important here is that these women would set off from Athens to Delphi, a walk of several days across the countryside, performing ritual dances along the way. It is not stated whether they made the pilgrimage without men, but as the Thyiades were maenads, men would not have been present at the rites which they conducted and it is not impossible to imagine the Thyiades travelling from Athens to Delphi and back again without male company.

According to Plutarch, during the Third Sacred War the Delphic Thyiades had danced all day and came to Amphissa, where they collapsed, worn out with their exertions, and slept the night there. In the morning, the local women looked after them, and having asked the permission of their husbands, accompanied the Thyiades to the border.<sup>41</sup> Another pilgrimage in which Athenian women participated was on the tenth of the month Pyanopsion, when Athenian women celebrated a sacrifice in honour of Demeter at Cape Kolias, some 13 kilometres from Athens.<sup>42</sup> This took place just before the three-day celebration of the Thesmophoria in Athens.

WOMEN AND THE OLYMPIC FESTIVAL

Pilgrimages to healing and mystery celebrations by women reflect the normal problems which were shared by both sexes: illness (and naturally a man felt anxiety about a wife's childlessness), and concerns about one's relationship with the gods. There was one

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

pilgrimage from which women were debarred, however, and this was the extremely popular pilgrimage to Olympia, where every four years thousands of Greeks would gather to worship Zeus and honour him with sacrifices and contests. While females, especially young girls, could engage in athletic practice,<sup>43</sup> panhellenic competitions were regarded, especially in the classical period, as primarily a male concern, perhaps because of the public display associated with them. However, women were not debarred as spectators from other panhellenic festivals, with Olympia being the exception.

The only female spectators permitted at the Olympic festival were parthenoi (virgins) and the priestess of Demeter Chamyne, whose official seat during the festival was an altar of white marble opposite the hellanodikai. It might seem strange that parthenoi should attend the games when there were so many naked men competing in a wide variety of sports, although at Sparta there was clearly no prudishness attached to such display, and surprise at this might be a modern one. By Eleian law any other woman detected at an Olympic gathering was to be hurled from Mount Tropaion, even though both maidens (parthenoi) and women (gynaikes) were admitted to the prothesis of the altar when the festival was not in progress.<sup>44</sup>

Pausanias writes that no woman (gyne) had been detected at the Olympic festival, except Kallipateira in the fourth century, who was also known as Pherenike. Because her husband had died she had undertaken to travel with her son Peisirodos, a boxer, to Olympia, disguised as his trainer. When Peisirodos won, Kallipateira, in her excitement, jumped over the fence separating the trainers from the competitors and in doing so revealed her genitalia. Despite the fact that she had broken the law she was spared the penalty of being thrown from Mount Tropaion, out of respect for the fact that her father (Diagoras of Rhodes) and brothers, and now her son, were Olympic victors. As a result a law was then passed about trainers, that they like the competitors were to be naked, so that a similar incident might not reoccur. Despite the pleasing nature of the story, it is probably an aetiological myth explaining why the trainers went naked.<sup>45</sup>

Yet, at around the time of the Olympic festival, competitions especially for unmarried women were held, though they were debarred from competing in the Olympia against men. According to Pausanias the 'Sixteen Women', who every fourth year wove a robe for the goddess Hera at Olympia, were also responsible for

#### THE FEMALE PILGRIM

conducting games in her honour, the Heraia, which dated back to 'ancient times'. These were races open to virgins, classified according to their age categories, who competed with their hair let down, with skirts just above the knees, and the right shoulder bare to the breast. The races were conducted at the Olympic stadium, but with its length reduced by one-sixth, and there were rewards and privileges for the successful: a crown of olive and a portion of a cow sacrificed to Hera were awarded to the victors. In addition they were entitled to dedicate statues with their names on them.<sup>46</sup> While it is not known whether these games took place at the same time as the Olympics, it is possible that they were held either immediately before or directly after them,<sup>47</sup> as this would be the best arrangement for encouraging attendance.

Burkert notes that on an evening before the Olympia, the women of Elis gathered in the gymnasium around the cenotaph of Achilles and did him honour, particularly by beating their breasts. He places the Heraia after the Olympia, arguing that the time in between, the Olympic festival, was forbidden to women: and hence the festival 'divided the family in order to illuminate its relationships'.<sup>48</sup> But the participants of the Heraia were not the women excluded from the Olympic festival, rather the participants were the very parthenoi who *could* attend the festival, and the bar on women was not an inversion of ordinary life aiming to underline normality. How well frequented the Heraia was is unknown, but it would have been convenient for spectators of the Olympia, and possibly the fathers of male competitors, to bring daughters with them in order to take part in these races at the same time.

While actual participation in the Olympia was forbidden them, women could sponsor chariots there. The Spartan Kyniska, daughter of Archidamos I king of Sparta, was the first woman to breed and own race-horses which won an Olympic chariot-racing event in 396 and 392, after her brother Agesilaos, who inherited the throne, encouraged her to do so. After her many women, particularly Spartans, won Olympic victories but Kyniska was the most famous, and at Olympia there was a statue group of a chariot team and driver with her portrait, by Apelles.<sup>49</sup>

No statue bases for the female victors at Hera's games at Olympia survive, and in fact there is only one inscription in existence, from Delphi, which mentions women who competed successfully in athletic competitions. This dates to the first century AD and records victories for the daughters of one Hermesianax in



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

competitions at the Pythian, Isthmian, Nemean, Sikyonian, Athenian Sebasteia, and Epidaurian festivals. Since Olympia is not mentioned it is possible that female competitors were never admitted to the Olympic festival itself:

Hermesianax son of Dionysios, citizen of Caesarea Tralles and also of Corinth, erected these statues of his daughters. . . . Tryphosa won the stade at the Pythian Games . . . and the stade at the . . . Isthmian games . . . the first girl ever to do so. Hedeia won the race for war chariots at the Isthmian Games . . . the stade at the Nemean Games . . . and the stade at the games in Sikyon . . . she won also the competition for girl harpists at the Sebasteia at Athens. . . . Dedicated to Pythian Apollo.<sup>50</sup>

The reference to Tryphosa being the first girl to win the stade at the Isthmia indicates that this race for girls had just been instituted, for it is almost certain that no panhellenic festival permitted females to compete against males in physical events. It could well be that the establishment of female competitions was a feature of the first century AD and the victory in both the athletic and the harp competitions by Hedeia is an indication that some girls showed versatility in their athletic and musical skills. One woman, Aristomache of Erythrai, was twice victorious in the contest in epic verse at the Isthmia.<sup>51</sup>

#### WOMEN AND CLOTHING REGULATIONS

The Pythagorean female writer Phintys wrote in the hellenistic period that women should wear white, undecorated, inexpensive garments, and not gold or emeralds.<sup>52</sup> In religion, the idea that clothing should be modest seems to have found expression in cult regulations. Much of the legislation concerning women at sacred sites deals with their clothing, and while a great deal of this was sumptuary in nature clearly there were also ritual reasons for the requirements. The cult inscription dealing with the mystery celebrations of the Great Goddesses at Andania in the Peloponnese has a lengthy section of fourteen lines on the type of clothing which those taking part (priests and priestesses, male initiates, female initiates and their daughters and slaves) in the cult ceremonies were to wear.<sup>53</sup> Even the priests (*hieroi*) and priestesses (*hierai*) had to observe certain proprieties of clothing, the priests

#### THE FEMALE PILGRIM

wearing a garland, and the priestesses a white felt cap. The board of ten in charge of the mysteries was to wear a purple headband during the mysteries. The priestesses were required to wear a kalasiris, a long garment of Egyptian origin with a fringe at the bottom, or a hypodyma, tunic, and a cloak worth not more than 2 minas, and their daughters a kalasiris, or cloak worth not more than 100 drachmas.

In the procession the priestesses had to wear a hypodyma and a woollen cloak, with stripes not more than half a finger wide, and their female children a kalasiris and a garment that was not diaphanous. The priestesses were to have wicker seats with either pillows, *potikephalaia*, or a white round cushion, with neither decoration nor a purple design, presumably for sitting on while presiding at the ceremonies.

There does not seem to be any other reference to the clothing of the priests, in contrast with the details given for the priestesses. Presumably the priestesses and their daughters played a greater part in the ritual of the cult, and it was most important that their dress be as correct as possible; alternatively it could be that women were considered to be more given to extravagance in dress than men, so that their clothing had to be more closely prescribed.

The first initiates wore a *stlengis*, a tiara, which they had to take off when instructed to do so by the priests, replacing it with a wreath of laurel. The only clothing regulation for males being initiated was that they were to be dressed in white clothing and go barefoot. Here bare feet stress that the rite took place outside of everyday life. The female initiates were to wear a garment which was neither transparent (and so respectable), with stripes not more than half a finger wide. The prohibition on stripes is interesting, and suggests that wide stripes were considered to be in some way 'showy' and not suitable for an initiate. The women being initiated were to wear a linen *chiton* and a cloak worth not more than 100 drachmas, while their daughters were to wear a kalasiris, or a *sindonites*, and a cloak, worth not more than 1 mina, while the same provisions applied to female slaves, except that in their case the value was limited to 50 drachmas. A *sindonites* was a garment of fine cloth, usually of linen; the Egyptians, as well as the Indians, Pythagoreans and Apollonios of Tyre, regarded linen as particularly pure, since it was not made of material which was animal in origin. Egyptian influence is probably to be assumed in the choice of the *sindonites* and kalasiris as garments at Andania.<sup>54</sup> The cult

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

regulations strongly emphasise lack of ostentation and decency of dress.

The nature of the legislation with regard to its restriction on the value of the clothes worn may have been aimed at a levelling of social distinctions, but the actual cost of the clothes, as high as 2 minas (200 drachmas) for a cloak, strongly suggests that many of the women came from an upper socio-economic level, and that the emphasis was more on the decent appearance of the female initiates than on the amount of money they spent on their dress; if there were not such regulations the women may well have dressed with some ostentation. Women obviously thought that the initiation was an occasion worth dressing up for. Even if the 2 minas is the upper limit this still implies that a lot of money was spent on clothes: the legislation is less sumptuary in nature than having an orientation towards what looks 'respectable'. The fact that the inscription concentrates on female initiates implies that they were the major proportion of the participants, and the specific nature of the dress required of them did not give much scope for any infraction of these regulations.

All of the women, both priestesses and initiates, were to be unadorned; gold ornaments, rouge, white make-up, hair bands and braided hair were forbidden, and their shoes could only be of felt or the leather of sacrificial victims. It is unlikely that the sacrificial victims from whose hides the shoes were to be made were sacrificed at an initial rite of participation, and then turned into shoes for the same ceremony, as the tanning and felting of hides would have taken some time to accomplish (indicating a sacrificial victim leather industry).

As with other aspects of this cult, provisions were made for those who did not conform to the cult regulations. Anyone wearing proscribed clothing or anything else forbidden was to be punished, with this punishment devoted to the gods,<sup>55</sup> so presumably some monetary fine is being alluded to here. No provision is made for those men who did not dress as required, but the same regulation possibly applied.

Despite its remote setting, the cult of Despoina at Lykosoura drew its clientele from all over Arcadia, and presumably worshippers came from other parts of the Greek world as well to participate in the mysteries. The regulations governing clothing in this cult were as follows: gold could not be worn into the temple, unless it was to be dedicated, the wearing of a purple garment was

#### THE FEMALE PILGRIM

forbidden, as were bright coloured or black ones, no shoes were allowed, nor could rings be worn. If any of these things were worn into the shrine, they were to become the property of the shrine. Just as braided hair was forbidden for women at Andania, so a woman with braided hair could not enter the shrine of Despoina, and men were to enter bare-headed.<sup>56</sup> The fact that in many cults, both mystery and healing cults, the pilgrim worshippers were required to wear white clothing placed an emphasis on the ritual purity of the worshipper.

#### WOMEN AS THEORODOKOI AND CULT PROSELYTISERS

As an activity that involved travel and the representation of one's state the office of *theoros* was restricted to men.<sup>57</sup> But women could be *theorodokoi*, and the six known cases include a monarch; Cleopatra, queen of Epeiros, was *theorodokos* for Argos in the late fourth century BC.<sup>58</sup> Epeiros was different from southern Greece in many ways but the Epeirotes were Greeks, and this case simply illustrates how much the focus of study of ancient Greece has been on the cities of southern Greece and Asia Minor. Wealth, a different political system, and presumably the social prominence which came with it, allowed for a deviation from the generally male chauvinistic nature of other Greek states.

There were several accounts of how the cult of Asklepios was spread by grateful pilgrims who had been cured at Epidauros, but only one female pilgrim is recorded as playing a role as a cult proselytiser. The Sikyonians had a clear account of how the god Asklepios came to them, from Epidauros, in the form of a serpent riding on a mule-drawn cart. Nikagora of Sikyon, mother of Agasikles and wife of Echetimos, was responsible for bringing him, and this story has clear parallels with that of Thersandros, who inadvertently took Asklepios' cult to Halieis, as in both cases the cult arrived as a serpent in a cart. One would not expect Nikagora, as a female, to have been sent by the Sikyonians to Epidauros for the express purpose of bringing back the cult of Asklepios. It therefore seems safe to conjecture that Nikagora had gone to Epidauros as a sick person, had been cured, and had brought back the god in the form of a serpent to Sikyon.<sup>59</sup> When (so to speak) the gods intervened, mortal men did not interfere in the divine choice of a female as a proselytiser.

### CHILDREN AS PILGRIMS

Children could be pilgrims: they were regular suppliants at the Epidaurian Asklepieion.<sup>60</sup> At the mysteries at Andania the daughters of the priestesses and initiates could be initiated,<sup>61</sup> as well as their female slaves, and in the Andanian Mysteries nothing hints that their initiation is of any lesser degree than their parents. In contrast to Andania, children were excluded from the Eleusinian Mysteries, and this was unusual, as most of the mystery celebrations did allow children to be initiated,<sup>62</sup> but at Eleusis, all the *mystai* were adults except for the single 'child of the hearth', whose role, according to Porphyry, was to propitiate the goddess on behalf of all the initiates.<sup>63</sup> The Eleusinian Mysteries involved a comprehension of the rites, and an understanding of the revelation which was at the core of the ceremony, and this presumably explained the restriction by which children, who might not comprehend the explanations or the ritual, were excluded from the Eleusinian Mysteries.

Male children were also competitors at panhellenic contests. There were three categories of competitors (except at Olympia): boys (pre-pubescent; *paides*), beardless youths (*ageneioi*) and men (*andres*). Pindar wrote several victory odes in honour of boy victors at the panhellenic contests, as did Bacchylides.<sup>64</sup> Boys could be as young as twelve, like Damiskos of Messene, who won the stade at Olympia at this age. At Olympia, the boys' age group extended to seventeen, then the men's category began.<sup>65</sup> The *hellenodikai* at Olympia and the *agonothetai* at the Pythian festival at Delphi were responsible for checking on age categories, and the superintendents of other festivals would also have had this duty.<sup>66</sup> While Olympia took age categories seriously, debarring boys who were too young or too old from competing in the boys' category, a boy competed in the boys', youths' and men's pankration on the same day in the contests at Smyrna, and was victorious in all three.<sup>67</sup> The inscription from Andros about a *theoria* to Delphi mentions boys and men.<sup>68</sup> Families of officials could accompany them: Peloponnesian *theoroi* travelling to Delphi took their wives and children with them.<sup>69</sup>

Every eight years the festival of the *Septerion* was celebrated at Delphi when a boy with both parents living performed a ritual together with members of the *Labyadai phratry* with lighted torches. This involved a mock attack on a hut, led by the boy, in

#### THE FEMALE PILGRIM

which they overturned a table in the hut, set fire to the latter, and fled without turning around. The boy then journeyed on foot with them on a pilgrimage to Tempe in Thessaly some 150 kilometres to the north, presumably along the 'Sacred Road' mentioned by Herodotos in a different context. Here a sacrifice was followed by the boy cutting a laurel branch which he took to Delphi, being acclaimed along the set route back to Delphi by the people of the territory through which he journeyed; the laurel would be used to crown the victors in the Pythian festival.<sup>70</sup> The involvement of children in pilgrimages to sacred sites reflects that they and their parents had concerns which could be dealt with within a religious framework.

#### AN ATHENIAN PILGRIMAGE TO BRAURON?

The chorus of old women in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* lists the religious duties which they carried out before marriage, amongst them being 'a bear (arktos) at the Brauronia, wearing the saffron-coloured robe (krokotos)'. The legend was that a she-bear had been killed in Artemis' sanctuary at Brauron, on the east coast of Attica, and to expiate the crime the goddess was appeased by girls acting as bears – arktoi – and serving the goddess in the rite of the arkteia. Every four years in the month Mounichion the Brauronia was celebrated in honour of the goddess Artemis.<sup>71</sup>

Girls attended the sanctuary at Brauron and were initiated into the rites of Artemis prior to puberty and marriage.<sup>72</sup> This marked their transition from girl to womanhood; Artemis' particular role was as the goddess of childbirth. The chorus of old women states that at ten they ground the corn for Artemis and then they were bears at the Brauronia. Excavations at Brauron have discovered vases, known as krateriskoi, which depict the activities of the girls at Brauron: naked or in short chitons, girls run and dance towards the altar (presumably of Artemis), on which a flame burns, or dance near the altar.<sup>73</sup>

The festival was penteteric in nature, and as girls had to enter Artemis' service before menarche, the first menstrual period, which the Greeks thought occurred in the fourteenth year (i.e. when girls turned 13),<sup>74</sup> the age-group of the girls participating in each four-yearly festival could have covered several years, 10 to 13, and this seems to be reflected on the krateriskoi. Aristophanes gives the age of arktoi as over 10, but the scholiast on this passage gives

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

the age 5 to 10, and some scholars describe the girls depicted on the krateriskoi as being as young as 8. However, Aristophanes is a contemporary authority, and the so-called 8-year-olds of the vases are easily 10 or more; Aristophanes' text can stand as this rite was clearly associated with puberty.<sup>75</sup>

When menarche took place, girls dedicated to Artemis their blood-stained menarche cloths (*rakoi*), indicating that the rites at Brauron were ones of passage, transitional rites marking the onset of adulthood and readiness for marriage.<sup>76</sup> Menstruation is a strange omission from Greek cult rules, which do not reflect concerns about menstruating women, who were therefore presumably free to take part in sacred ceremonies.<sup>77</sup> The clothing of women who died in childbirth was offered to Iphigeneia, 'strong in birth', who was connected with Artemis' cult at Brauron; the 'half-woven' items listed in the records of dedications can only be cloth which women did not finish weaving before their death in childbirth. The role of Artemis as blood-letter in the hunt presumably explains her role as presiding over menarche and childbirth.<sup>78</sup> Artemis Brauronia had a temple on the Athenian acropolis, and the same lists of items dedicated to Artemis at Brauron were recorded both on the acropolis and at Brauron. Women dedicated clothes in particular, though items of precious metal are also found.<sup>79</sup> Pausanias refers to a shrine of Artemis Brauronia on the acropolis, and there was a procession from here to Brauron at the time of the Brauronia.<sup>80</sup>

Two late sources claim that participation in the Brauronia was compulsory for all Athenian girls, and that a man would not marry a maiden who had not acted the bear for the goddess. Others note that the rite occurred before marriage, which is different from its being compulsory, and the scholiast and Suda have taken the evidence too far in claiming a compulsory nature for the *arkteia*.<sup>81</sup> The various religious duties as recited in the passage from Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* were all performed by small numbers of girls and 'acting the bear' was probably similarly limited.<sup>82</sup>

If the *arkteia* was a compulsory rite for all Athenian parthenoi, then this was an extraordinary procession. However, only a few Athenian girls will have made this pilgrimage. Moreover, the discovery of krateriskoi in other Artemis sanctuaries in Attica points to rites similar to the *arkteia* throughout Attica, making a puberty pilgrimage to Brauron unnecessary for most.<sup>83</sup>

## THE FEMALE PILGRIM

### CONCLUSION

Pilgrimage required leisure time, and also financial outlay, so it can probably be assumed that women of means participated, whereas poorer women would have found it difficult to obtain the resources to pay for sustenance along the way and at the site. This contradicts widely held views: while it is often argued that women in Athens from well-to-do families were secluded, it is clear that it is precisely the women belonging to the elite class in Greek cities who were most likely to have travelled from their homes in search of pregnancies, cures or oracles. There is the possibility that women from well-off families went on long pilgrimages, and when the pilgrimage was to a sanctuary only a day away, as in the case of Eleusis from Athens, even poor women may have been involved.

Pilgrimage affected the lifestyles of the women who participated: it might even mean the birth of children, bringing into being a family and the consequent restructuring of family relationships. Pilgrimage was one of the few occasions when free citizen women might venture outside their home city, escaping the parochialism and narrowness which characterised the culture of the patriarchal Greek polis, especially Athens. The women who travelled far from their homes in search of cures or initiation have been relatively neglected, and this chapter has been an attempt to begin to rectify this undeserved omission.



## ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

Several of the prohibitions placed on pilgrims had a religious motivation. These included dietary restrictions, sexual abstinence, and the general need for ritual purity on the part of the worshipper, and they were an important part of the cult ritual in which pilgrims were involved at sacred sites. Other regulations and restrictions were of a non-religious nature, and included important prescriptions determining the way in which pilgrims were expected to behave at the sanctuary. These regulations were frequently inscribed on stone where they could be seen by the worshippers. There were various rules at sacred sites concerning matters such as the accommodation of pilgrims, the parking of vehicles, the lighting of fires, the use of water and bathing facilities, the pasturing of herds, and the need for honest dealing at markets where the pilgrims bought their necessities. In the athletic sphere regulations covered bribery and cheating, and laid down rules for contests and competitors.

### THE BEHAVIOUR OF WORSHIPPERS

The behaviour of worshippers at sanctuaries was, of course, a matter of importance not only for the authorities of the sanctuary but also in the case of official pilgrimages for the states sending pilgrims and officials to a particular site as their representatives. It is perhaps significant that the only specific recorded examples of individuals guilty of misconduct at a festival involved athletes; nevertheless regulations from numerous sacred sites make provision for misbehaviour by other pilgrims. Crime at panhellenic sanctuaries could include theft, disorderly conduct, and misdemeanours which could damage a sanctuary's buildings and

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

property. Menander in describing a festival mentions thieves,<sup>1</sup> and the authorities would presumably have taken prompt action in any cases where such crimes were detected.

In the inscription giving regulations governing the behaviour of the Andrians participating in a *theoria* to Delphi, the *boule* was to appoint five men from among the number of those travelling to Delphi; these five were to deal with those behaving in a disorderly way, being instructed to fine them at the rate of 5 drachmas a day for each day of the pilgrim's misconduct. They were to record the relevant names and submit these to the Andrian *boule* on their return. This provision indicates the possibility of further punishment, perhaps in the form of a formal prosecution, and pilgrims who participated in the Andrian *theoria* had to accept the authority of their home-state, represented by the five men who had sworn to monitor the conduct of the *theoria*.<sup>2</sup>

Andros held the pilgrims accountable to itself for their behaviour. They were representing their island, and misbehaviour at the sacred site would reflect badly on their city. Moreover, the desire that the *theoria* should go smoothly indicated the seriousness with which participation in this Delphic celebration, as in other festivals, was regarded. The decree does not detail precisely what disorderly behaviour might have entailed: drunkenness, vandalism, and failure to observe the regulations set down by the authorities at Delphi are all possible forms of inappropriate conduct.

Penalties for misconduct could also be imposed by the host nation, and the Athenians made provision for punishing those who were disorderly at the Eleusinian Mysteries who could be fined or taken to court by the superintendents (*epimeletai*) of the mysteries.<sup>3</sup> With thousands annually attending the mysteries, there would always have been the possibility that individuals who were present might infringe the regulations governing the behaviour of worshippers.

The fourth-century decree of the *Amphiaraion* at Oropos empowered the priest to judge strangers or citizens who committed misdemeanours in the shrine, if the matter did not exceed 3 drachmas. Incidents involving more than this amount were to come within the competence of the courts. Action was to be taken immediately: the summons was to take place on the very day of the incident, and if the wrongdoer did not come to an agreement the trial would be held on the next day. The prompt action on

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

wrongdoing relates to the fact that the clientele was not all local: cases in which *xenoi* (strangers) were mistreated or misbehaved would have needed to be dealt with straight away for the sake of convenience, while summary justice would also have acted as a deterrent to wrongdoers.<sup>4</sup>

#### ABSTINENCE FROM WINE

The fact that pilgrims abstained from wine for part of the Eleusinian Mysteries would have been of assistance in ensuring that behaviour was kept within acceptable bounds, and presumably the solemn nature of the rite itself would have ensured their good conduct.<sup>5</sup> However, at Knidos a decree was passed forbidding men and women from sleeping in the sanctuary of Bakchos because of damage done to the shrine by those who had slept there: the Bacchants may well have been drunk. Alcohol was, of course, always a temptation. At Delphi, wine was not to be taken onto the race-track; if it was, the offender had to make a libation and a sacrifice and pay a fine of 5 drachmas (with half going to the informer). Wine, naturally enough, was not recommended for athletes, but was not actually prohibited.<sup>6</sup>

#### ACCOMMODATION FOR PILGRIMS

Many regulations dealt with the worshipper in the context of the natural environment of the sanctuary. Large numbers of worshippers could be expected at major shrines and population pressures on a small area can be disastrous. The temple authorities had a clear awareness of the deleterious effect that they could have, and numerous regulations dealt with protection of the environment of the sanctuary. Human pressures at sanctuaries took the form of vehicular traffic, the need for accommodation, and the demand for wood for cooking and bathing purposes, as well as arrangements for the animals accompanying the pilgrims, whether for transport or for sacrificing.

The pressure arising from the need for accommodation for worshippers was obviously severe, but despite the fact that crowds of religious devotees from various places could be expected at many festivals, the authorities responsible made few arrangements for ensuring that pilgrims were adequately housed. Official pilgrims, that is the members of *theoriai* sent by their states to represent

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

them at panhellenic events, might have accommodation organised for them but this was not the case for ordinary pilgrims. Two Delphic inscriptions deal with the case of ambassadors at Delphi who stayed with a citizen, and who complained to the Delphic authorities that the accommodation they were given was poorer than in previous years. It is possible to argue that these ambassadors were theoroi attending the Pythia, and that their host was a theorodokos.<sup>7</sup>

The institution of the theorodokia in itself indicates that accommodation was not generally provided by the host-state for ordinary pilgrims, as the theorodokoi took the responsibility for providing accommodation for the important official pilgrims, the theoroi, who were attending religious celebrations. In some instances, however, there was permanent accommodation available at the site, in the form of katagogia, 'lodging houses', usually only for officials. Other pilgrims pitched tents, and sometimes not only ordinary pilgrims but even members of official embassies had to do the same.

The katagogion known as the Leonidaion at Olympia has been described as a building reserved for visiting officials and dignitaries,<sup>8</sup> but it is also clear that it could not possibly house all of the theoroi attending the Olympic festival. The building was fairly large (74.82 × 81.8 m.), but the number of the rooms was not great,<sup>9</sup> and it should not be supposed that it accommodated many visitors. Although some theoroi from important states may have been invited to stay at the Leonidaion, the majority of theoroi apparently had to find their own accommodation,<sup>10</sup> and it seems that the Athenian theoria was one of those that did not have the privilege of accommodation in the Leonidaion.<sup>11</sup>

Other katagogia have been identified at Epidauros and Oropos, while a katagogion at Plataea is attested by Thucydides; there was also a xenon ('guest-house') at Nemea. The katagogion at Epidauros compared favourably in size with the Leonidaion at Olympia, and had more rooms, clustering around four square courtyards.<sup>12</sup> Clearly Epidauros could claim a reputation rivalling that of Olympia, and the size of the katagogion is a reflection of the importance of this site. The building would have housed dignitaries attending the penteteric Epidaurian festival, and presumably important people who visited Epidauros in search of a cure would have made use of the building.<sup>13</sup> At Oropos there are the remains of two complexes, probably dating to the third century BC, which

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

have been identified, but not conclusively, as dwelling places for pilgrims.<sup>14</sup> The katagogion at Plataea, as well as a stone temple dedicated to Hera, was constructed by the Spartans in the vicinity of the sanctuary of Hera from building materials salvaged from the polis, which they had completely razed in 426.<sup>15</sup> Clearly, worship was to be continued at Plataea, including celebration of the Eleutheria, with the katagogion being built for the officials attending this festival.<sup>16</sup> It seems that religious sites away from centres of population were sometimes provided with a hostel, but that any such hostel would fail to accommodate pilgrims in large numbers.

The xenon at Nemea was much smaller than the Leonidaion or Epidaurian katagogion, being divided into several separate apartments, with sleeping and dining areas in each. It has been suggested that the xenon was for the more important visitors, or perhaps for the athletes, but the further suggestion that each apartment was occupied by contestants in a specific event has nothing to recommend it.<sup>17</sup> Evidence for the Isthmia indicates that there was accommodation provided by the authorities for competitors. In the second century AD the Roman governor of Achaia granted permission to an individual, Priscus, to purchase the ruins of an old stoa and to convert it into a complex of fifty rooms. But the permission came with the proviso that the rooms be given over, in perpetuity, for the use of athletes at the Isthmian festival, free of charge; the agonothetai in charge of the contests were to allocate the rooms to the athletes.<sup>18</sup>

Pilgrims attending festivals or sacred mysteries in populated centres may have been able to find accommodation in inns, hotels and other lodging houses, while a type of private board may also have been available. The demos of the Athenians, stated the writer of the Xenophontic *Athenaion Politeia*, derived many benefits from the fact that the allies were obliged to have many of their law-suits tried at Athens, which included the profit to be made on hiring out rooms by those who had extra space in their houses.<sup>19</sup> The influx of pilgrims at festival sites near urban centres would have provided similar opportunities for the exploitation of those in need of lodging by those with the requisite facilities. Delphi would have had a constant stream of visitors; however, other festivals such as the Isthmia occurred only every two years, so that demand for accommodation would have been limited to the period of the festival.

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

Practical considerations explain why religious centres, despite attracting large numbers of pilgrims, did not attempt to provide accommodation. For example, the panhellenic Olympic festival was the only panhellenic celebration that occurred at this site, and so every four years the site would be crowded with pilgrims. Since on no other occasion would Olympia attract visitors on this or even on a greatly reduced scale, the building and provision of permanent dwellings was not feasible, unless exorbitant rents were charged at festival times.

That most pilgrims made use of temporary accommodation is clear from several references to the use of *skenai* (tents) by pilgrims.<sup>20</sup> Many tents, especially official ones, were probably well built using stout poles for the support of the tanned hides which comprised the walls and roof. The tents of Dionysios' *theoria* at Olympia were interwoven with gold and decorated with expensive coloured cloth. On the other hand, tents might be made of reeds and any material to hand.<sup>21</sup> The fact that *skenai* were temporary affairs is reinforced by the different terminology used for permanent shops: at the Heraion on Samos the latter are termed *kapeleia*.<sup>22</sup> That even important pilgrims, including officials, had to pitch tents is clear. The Delphic Amphictyons honoured a fellow Amphictyon, Mentor of Naupaktos, with the right of the 'first tent'.<sup>23</sup> When the Amphictyonic council met at Delphi the members would stay in tents, but in future Mentor, a fellow Amphictyon, would have the best site.

The best evidence for tents comes from the inscribed cult regulations of the sacred mysteries of Andania, in the Peloponnese, which were annual in nature, but even so this did not make the erection of permanent accommodation for pilgrims feasible. This first-century BC inscription has a separate section devoted to the tents, *skenai*, of pilgrim-initiates, suggesting that these were the main if not the only means of shelter for the pilgrims. These tents were under the jurisdiction of the priests in charge of many aspects of the mysteries. This Andanian inscription records a stipulation on the size of the tents; each side was to be a maximum of 30 feet, and it was forbidden for curtains and screens to be placed around the tents.<sup>24</sup>

It is perhaps possible that the restriction on the size of tents aimed at blurring the socio-economic differences between initiates, because they were all equal in the eyes of the deity. This idea, however, is not supported by the regulation in the same inscription

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

which forbade initiates from keeping couches or silver plate to the value of more than 300 drachmas in their tents. While this might have been intended as sumptuary legislation, the fact that the permissible amount of property allowed was 300 drachmas, a generous sum, and that there was emphasis placed in the inscription on keeping order and on good behaviour, could mean that these restrictions on the amount of personal property to be kept in the tents were a precaution against theft and associated problems.<sup>25</sup>

There were restrictions, at least at some sacred sites, on where tents could be erected. No one was allowed to pitch tents in the stoa of Attalos,<sup>26</sup> while at Andania no one other than the priests of the cult was to pitch a tent within the area marked off by them.<sup>27</sup> Andania was presumably a less popular pilgrim destination than other sites, such as Delphi and Olympia, but the necessity for tents prevailed at larger cult centres as well. In a fragment of a play by the comic poet Heniochos mention is made of a theoric skene (tent) at Olympia.<sup>28</sup> Certainly competitors at the Olympic games stayed in tents: Alkibiades, for example, when he competed, had a tent provided by the Ephesians which was twice the size of the tent of the Athenian theoria.<sup>29</sup>

Aelian records that Plato while at Olympia stayed in a tent which he shared with strangers. Pilgrims may have travelled to Olympia and other sacred sites without their own tents, in the hope that they might be able to share with other campers who had room to spare. Those who had tents may have rented out space to those who had no tent of their own.<sup>30</sup> In a passage from Aristophanes' *Peace* one of the characters secures a place in advance of the festival for his tent at the Isthmian festival by marking out a circle in which to erect it;<sup>31</sup> there was clearly competition for the best site.

A third-century AD inscription from Olympia which appears to deal with competitors and spectators mentions [κα]ταλύσεις ἀξιούμ[ενου], 'those wanting accommodation' (?) and might refer to some provision or rule about lodging.<sup>32</sup> Lucian in a list of complaints about Olympia, including the heat and lack of space, mentions the skenai and kalybai, the tents and huts, and considered these temporary accommodations as inconveniences.<sup>33</sup> All the citizens, and the men and women 'living around', took part in the annual festival of Artemis at her temple founded by Xenophon at Skillous near Olympia, and the 'goddess' provided food for those encamped in tents.<sup>34</sup> A letter of Antigonos to the people of Teos

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

in the last decade of the fourth century BC also contains a reference to camping at the Panionia, where the delegates from Lebedos and Teos are to share this accommodation.<sup>35</sup>

Normally, sleeping in temples was not allowed and pilgrims when visiting sacred sites would not have expected to sleep in sacred buildings. For example, a decree forbids sleeping in the shrine of Zeus at Magnesia, while at Samos various activities including camping were forbidden in the sanctuary.<sup>36</sup> In 431 some Athenians, abandoning the countryside, took up residence in temples and the shrines of the heroes, except for those on the Acropolis and the Eleusinion, but this was only in exceptional circumstances.<sup>37</sup> The Boeotians in 424 protested that the Athenians were living in the sanctuary at Delion and profaning it. However, the Spartan king Agesilaos had no scruples about using sanctuaries as accommodation.<sup>38</sup>

The healing sanctuaries belong to a different category, in that sick individuals slept in the *abata* hoping for a healing vision. The *abata* were, however, holy places, and Pausanias notes that only in his own time was a building constructed at Epidauros in which women could give birth and people could die; previously women gave birth and people died of their sicknesses in the open air.<sup>39</sup> But at the sanctuary of Asklepios at Tithorea there were dwellings for both the suppliants of the god and his priests at the sanctuary. By way of contrast, the shrine of Isis, about 7 kilometres from Asklepios' temple at Tithorea, was the holiest Greek shrine to the Egyptian goddess, and the Tithoreans thought that no one should dwell near it. No one was allowed to enter the shrine unless Isis summoned them through a dream, and even then the dreamer would need to find accommodation outside the area considered to be too holy for dwellings.<sup>40</sup>

#### SACRIFICIAL BEASTS AND TRANSPORT

Pasturing domestic animals in sanctuaries was forbidden. Such animals would have had an adverse effect on the sanctuary environment, removing grasses which, if the number of animals were great enough, could leave the soil open to erosion and degradation, such as soil compaction. That the number of animals was realised to be significant is indicated by the fact that some of the regulations provide fines for pasturing based on the number of animals in the offending flock. Sheep and goats can also eat foliage directly off



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

trees; and that leaves were of concern to the temple authorities is indicated by the provisions against the cutting or removal of branches from the trees in one sanctuary.<sup>41</sup> At Delphi, 'sacred' animals could be grazed in a special area of sacred land, and on Ios the beasts intended for sacrifice had to be branded; non-branded beasts in the sacred area would be confiscated.<sup>42</sup> Given the regulations from other sites forbidding the pasturing of animals in the sanctuary, arrangements similar to those at Delphi must have been usual at other sites.

Worshippers entered the shrine on foot. Vehicular access to sanctuaries was not allowed, and vehicles had to be left outside of the main sanctuary area, for example, at Eleusis, in an area called the chorion.<sup>43</sup> This legislation was probably sumptuary in nature. Aristophanes in *Wealth* (388 BC) indicates that pilgrim mystai could go to Eleusis by carriage, but Lykourgos in the late fourth century introduced a law that no woman should ride to Eleusis in a carriage, so that wealthy women going by carriage would not seem of more significance than poor women who had no transport. His own wife, however, was detected doing so.<sup>44</sup> Most of the initiates would, however, presumably have walked to Eleusis and back again.

Approaching a sanctuary on foot was not merely an act of humility on the part of the worshippers, but was perhaps an effort by the authorities to preserve the grounds of the temple. Vehicular traffic would lead to inevitable wheel ruts, and like the pasturing of animals would cause the destruction of surface grass.

#### RESTRICTIONS ON FIRE-LIGHTING

The trees were the most important and most visible element of the environment of the sanctuary, and as such were protected from various types of activities such as chopping, hacking and defoliation. The use of wood for heating water for bathing and other purposes by worshippers also led to concern for the trees of the sacred site. At Andania, those who made money by providing bathing facilities at the mysteries were to use their own firewood for this purpose, and the trees of the sanctuary were not to be touched. The Andanian inscription has a section headed 'Concerning those chopping (wood) in the sacred area', which begins 'no one is to chop wood from the sacred place'. That cutting firewood from the trees at this sacred place was considered

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

to be a particularly heinous offence is made apparent by the provision encouraging the practice of informing about this act, by giving the informant half the fine imposed on the one caught chopping wood in the sacred area (a slave was to be scourged):<sup>45</sup> no other regulation in the Andanian cult rules provides for the reward of informants. Its significance is obviously that if worshippers had been allowed to gather firewood indiscriminately in the sacred grove, there would soon have been no grove left, due to the demands of cooking and heating. Another inscription from a sanctuary of Apollo at Athens forbids the cutting of wood in the sanctuary of Apollo, as well as the carrying of fallen wood or branches out of the sanctuary.<sup>46</sup>

A concern that fire might break out at sacred sites is not documented, but at Amorgos it was forbidden for fires to be lit in the sacred area itself.<sup>47</sup> Temples could burn down, that of Hera at Argos being an example,<sup>48</sup> and restriction of the campers at Andania to a special area, presumably away from the temple complex itself,<sup>49</sup> may have been at least partly motivated by this consideration. The Argives believed that the Spartan king Kleomenes was sent mad for deliberately burning down a grove sacred to Argos, with several thousand Argives in it.<sup>50</sup> Restrictions on lighting fires occur at several sanctuaries and probably stem from a desire to protect sacred buildings and trees from conflagration.

#### WATER REGULATIONS

Regulations governed the use of water at many sites,<sup>51</sup> a necessary precaution both because of the general shortage of water at many sites in Greece under normal conditions, and because a festival at a pilgrimage site would attract hundreds or thousands of pilgrims who would place severe strains on the water supply. Lucian, for example, comments on the scarcity of water at Olympia during the festival period, stating that Herodes Atticus built a water system at Olympia which meant that visitors 'no longer died of thirst'. Proteus the Cynic condemned the action, claiming that it made the Greeks effeminate, as they ought to endure the thirst brought on by the heat at Olympia.<sup>52</sup> The late fourth-century BC stadium at Nemea was provided with a water channel of porous limestone around its perimeter, with settling basins to help keep the water clean; the water will have served contestants and spectators alike.<sup>53</sup> In 333/2 BC the superintendent of the springs at

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

Athens repaired the fountain-house and water-works at the Amphiaraion at Oropos.<sup>54</sup>

Water had ritual significance, being widely used for purification,<sup>55</sup> and was also a practical necessity, for bathing and cooking. The Andanian inscription providing for the purity of the water supply is an example of regulations ensuring that the quality and quantity of this resource was maintained. The agoranomos, market supervisor, had charge of the water supply and had to ensure that at the time of the festival the sluices and conduits supplying water were undamaged and that no one was hindered from having access to an adequate supply. The penalties imposed for contravening this regulation were a scourging for slaves and a fine of 20 drachmas for a free man. The same punishment applied for those who failed to observe the regulations concerning the provision of bathing facilities: it was also thought important at Andania that baths be available daily to pilgrims, for 'anointing and bathing', and the agoranomos was instructed to make sure that dealers who provided baths, including the bathtub, warm water and the necessary wood, should not charge more than two copper coins.<sup>56</sup> With large numbers of pilgrims attending sacred sites, it could be assumed that one of the main preoccupations of a site preparing to receive pilgrims would have been the provision of water, which of course pilgrims could not bring with them, but no such provision was made at Olympia in classical and hellenistic times.

#### MARKETS AT SACRED SITES

Any festival in the Greek world might also be accompanied by a market. This is true of pilgrimage festivals as well where markets sold not simply foodstuffs for the pilgrims but other items as well, and so worship and trade were combined. A panegyris, a festival, was primarily a religious festival, which might have an economic aspect as well, in the form of a market, which could be either simply to provide for the needs of pilgrims who went there, or could be a larger market taking advantage of the numbers of pilgrims in order to sell other types of goods.<sup>57</sup> Ritual items, such as the local boots needed for a consultation of Trophonios at Lebadeia, were probably also for sale.<sup>58</sup> The main requirements of pilgrims would have been food, shelter and water. They could have brought some of their food with them, as seems to be shown on the Niinnion tablet.<sup>59</sup>

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

While pilgrims would presumably have brought some non-perishable food items with them, food supplies were officially taken care of by the provision of market-places. At Andania, the dealers were punished if they failed to be honest, and they had to use the weights and measures agreed to by the demos, or be flogged if a slave or fined 20 drachmas if a free trader, which was the same punishment as for those who interfered with the water supply, or failed to observe the regulations about baths. The dealers at Andania, however, were also protected. There was to be no charge for the space in the market-place which they occupied, the agoranomos was to set no price limits, and there were to be no fixed times for the market; the entrepreneur was encouraged.<sup>60</sup> At Eleusis, the public slave who supervised the use of official weights and measures would be punished for offences in this matter by the hierophant and the officials in charge of the annual panegyris, and presumably this could be taken to refer to the celebration of the mysteries. Pilgrims came to Eleusis for several days each year and there would have been a strong demand for a market selling food and other necessities, and so weights and measures would have had to be strictly controlled.<sup>61</sup>

At Ilium in the Troad in the second century BC the agoranomos for the Panathenaia was honoured for having taken care of the food supply during the festival. His responsibility may only have been towards competitors but may also have included the organisation and supply of enough food in the city for the many hundreds of pilgrims who attended the festival from the neighbouring cities.<sup>62</sup> An inscription from Akraiphia in Boeotia, about 2½ kilometres from the temple and oracle of Apollo Ptoios, lists prices for fish, possibly for the benefit of consultants and those attending the festival.<sup>63</sup>

Presumably traders were present at all panhellenic celebrations. Pythagoras is said to have compared life to a festival: some went as competitors, others as to a market, but the best went as spectators.<sup>64</sup> Dio Chrysostom wrote that many went to festivals to see the sights and to spend from dawn to dusk watching the contests, while many others brought wares of all kinds to sell.<sup>65</sup> At the Isthmian festival, for example, Dio records that there were hawkers selling all possible items, along with sources of entertainment such as jugglers, poets, fortune tellers and peddlers; Diogenes the Cynic was also present. Menander in describing a festival mentions a market, dice-playing, thieves and entertainments. Olympia, isolated

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

and not attached to a major town or city, naturally had a market to serve the needs of the pilgrims.<sup>66</sup> Those who brought their sacrificial animals with them or who purchased them at Elis or nearby towns would have had a ready source of food once the sacrifices had been made; the priests who received a share of the sacrifices as a perquisite of their office could have sold this to worshippers. At Didyma the sacrifice was to be consumed in a tent set up for this purpose, but if anyone wanted to they could take the meat away, but had to pay for it. The relevant inscription is incomplete but includes a reference to the *mageiroi*, the sacrificial butchers, who were to sell the heads of the beasts.<sup>67</sup>

Other festivals were also accompanied by markets. Strabo could describe the festival of Apollo on Delos as a 'commercial affair',<sup>68</sup> and at Delos many of the inhabitants made a livelihood from pilgrims visiting the island.<sup>69</sup> In circa 200 BC the festival of Apollo at Actium was incorporated as a festival of the Akarnanian League; that is, it became a league festival, and the slave market held there was incorporated as part of the festival.<sup>70</sup> An inscription recording the revenue of a Boeotian temple includes an entry concerning money from the rent of *skenai*. These *skenai*, it has been suggested, were occupied by traders and their wares for a market associated with a festival,<sup>71</sup> but may have been tents rented as accommodation.

While there is little evidence for money-changing facilities, naturally there would have been a need to change money into the local currency or for the vendors to accept the currency of other cities. A Delphic Amphictyonic decree of the second century BC provided that there be an exchange rate of one Attic tetradrachma to four silver drachmas.<sup>72</sup> Those in charge in the cities and the festivals were to enforce this rate; if the money-changers in the cities and at festivals did not accept this rate they could be brought before the authorities by anyone who wished to do so. This was presumably intended more for commercial transactions in the cities, but since festivals are specifically mentioned alongside the cities the regulation would also have affected pilgrims purchasing necessities while at Delphi, and it would be in line with the Andanian decree with its regulations concerning trading and the punishment of dishonest traders.

The 'kapeloi' inscription from the Heraion at Samos regulated the activities of sellers (*kapeloi*) in the sanctuary – there were four legitimate sellers with booths – and attempted to restrict the activities of soldiers, suppliants, unemployed persons (*apergoi*, perhaps

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

beggars) and slaves, who were forbidden to sell anything in the sanctuary.<sup>73</sup> Whether pilgrims made their way to Hera's sanctuary is unknown, but presumably at other sites various sellers of different backgrounds took advantage of the opportunity for trade offered by worshippers.

Regulations at sites could have been of economic advantage to local traders.<sup>74</sup> Broughton argues that periodic festivals in the Roman period were economic investments, with the cities of Asia Minor keen to promote their festivals as a means of bringing money into the city. Also referring to the Roman period, MacMullen considered visitors to festivals as 'good business' for the city involved.<sup>75</sup> Such arguments are partly based on the fact that during some festivals certain taxes associated with trade were dropped, possibly as a means of encouraging attendance. However, this was often but not always the case; the Akarnanian League collected taxes on the sale of slaves during the festival at Actium.<sup>76</sup> Certainly festivals brought benefits, but not always on a scale which would have been of great economic assistance to the city hosting the festival (most pilgrims, as has been discussed, stayed in tents), though individual traders could have made a lot of money. Moreover, that city authorities organised festivals in order to benefit the business class of the relevant city is not in accord with ancient economic practice: as a rule, the state did not generally encourage business.

De Ligt and de Neeve argue against any economic interpretation for the advertisement and promotion of festivals in the Roman period, and believe that festivals were advertised and taxes dropped during their celebration (in some cases) as part of 'civic pride and intercity rivalry'. A panegyris was more successful the more people that attended it, and dropping sales taxes may have been thought to contribute to this.<sup>77</sup> On the other hand, it cannot be denied that a community could benefit from visiting pilgrims: the inhabitants of both Delos and Delphi were entitled to generous shares in the animals sacrificed by worshippers.<sup>78</sup>

#### ITINERANT CRAFTSMEN AT PANHELLENIC SITES

The itinerant traders who congregated at festivals were joined by craftsmen who provided votive offerings for dedication in the sanctuaries of the gods. Leaving aside Pheidias' workshop, no metal foundry has been discovered at Olympia but evidence

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

strongly suggests that metal working did take place here, as many misshapen metal castings, and other evidence of bronze-casting, have been found. If the foundries were of a temporary nature, set up only for the festival, this would explain why no archaeological trace of them has survived.<sup>79</sup> Because the unsuccessful castings were found in the same archaeological layers as soundly produced figurines, Neugebauer suggested that the misshapen votives would have been bought and dedicated by those who could not afford the properly cast ones, but this view has been rejected,<sup>80</sup> and the emphasis on making unblemished offerings makes this hypothesis unlikely. Moreover, in addition to these miscast pieces, many of the votive offerings discovered at Olympia are often of poor execution, being of a type that could be produced quickly: small and simple in design. It seems that temporary smelting arrangements were used to produce the large quantities of dedications needed by those attending the festival: votive horses, oxen and deer make up the vast proportion of the votives at this site. The stereotyped nature of the dedications and their uniformity indicates that they were purchased at Olympia.

The situation at Olympia is reflected at other Greek sanctuaries. The lack of permanent metal-working facilities, and the fact that at panhellenic festival sites there would have been a large influx of pilgrims but at other times little or no market for votives, suggests that the craftsmen who made the votives were itinerants, who made their way to festival sites to meet the needs of pilgrims who wished to dedicate items while at the sanctuaries.<sup>81</sup> In fact, the panhellenic festivals are linked by a metallurgical feature: Morgan states that 'both the range of metalwork and the evidence of casting debris from all four of the great Archaic inter-state festival sites, Nemea, Isthmia, Olympia and Delphi, are remarkably similar', and that just as the four festivals were part of an athletic circuit by the fifth century, craftsmen probably also had a similar cycle, while Miller notes that one kouros at Isthmia was made from the same mould as one from Nemea.<sup>82</sup>

These craftsmen met an important religious need: whereas the wealthy could dedicate tripods (particularly at Delphi and Olympia), others would have needed cheaper items for dedication. Pilgrims could purchase a suitable and cheap item and dedicate it to the appropriate deity, fulfilling this religious 'duty': at most pilgrimage centres (with the notable exception of Epidauros, where there was a good deal of pressure from the temple authorities to

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

make a dedication), the votive was not specifically required as part of the cult activity but was a need felt by the worshipper. A distinction, however, has to be made between the panhellenic festivals which were held regularly but only at specific times, and panhellenic pilgrimage sites which were 'open' all the time. Epidauros and Delphi received consultants throughout the year. In these cases there may well have been local, rather than itinerant craftsmen, who met the needs of these pilgrims. The festival circuit, in contrast, involved not only athletes and spectators, but also the craftsmen and itinerant traders who serviced the needs of these visitors.

#### DEATH AT SACRED SITES

There is very little information about regulations and practices concerning pilgrims who died while they were on pilgrimage. The majority of deaths at sacred sites would have occurred at Epidauros and other healing sanctuaries throughout Greece and Asia Minor. There is evidence concerning those who went to healing sanctuaries and failed to receive a cure. All of the Epidaurian *iamata* are records of the successful cures of worshippers, either at the site, or on the way home. It is, however, clear from Pausanias that people did die at Epidauros,<sup>83</sup> and only in his own day was a building erected for the use of those who were dying and in childbirth, in which people could die or give birth without the stain of sacrilege. The building was erected by the senator Antoninus: this is sometimes thought to be a reference to the emperor Antoninus Pius, but Habicht argues strongly that this is not the case. That such a building was not erected until this time indicates that conditions at panhellenic sanctuaries could be primitive, and that the *katagogion* at Epidauros was reserved for visiting dignitaries.

Many pilgrims to Epidauros were presumably accompanied by relatives, friends or servants, and these took care of the dead. Whether they were buried at Epidauros, or their bodies cremated and the ashes taken home is uncertain, but as there is no evidence for a cemetery at the site it was probably the case that dead pilgrims were buried at home. Burial of a deceased pilgrim would not have taken place within the sacred site. No one, for example, was allowed to be buried on Delos, so pilgrims to the Ionian celebrations who died there would not have been buried there.



#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

Those who were dying were taken to the nearby island of Rheneia, as were women in childbirth.<sup>84</sup> While there is no record of a pilgrim actually dying while on Delos, the restriction on dying here is significant; meant primarily for the local inhabitants, it emphatically illustrates the aversion to death at sacred places.

The ruling from the sanctuary on Kos requiring that it be purified if anyone died in the temple acknowledges the realities of the human condition: people die unexpectedly, and in awkward situations, but it was still not acceptable on sacred soil. When Kreousa while at Delphi attempted to murder Ion, her own unrecognised son, Apollo himself revealed the plot to avoid the consequent pollution and Kreousa was sentenced to a ritual punishment, to be flung from a rock for attempting to murder a temple servant within the sanctuary.<sup>85</sup>

The greatest proportion of unexpected fatalities will have occurred in the panhellenic contests, where the contests involving physical contact could be violent. For participants in these festivals, there were clearly risks, and boxing, wrestling and the pankration occasionally proved fatal to contestants.<sup>86</sup> Killing one's opponent did not necessarily result in disqualification.<sup>87</sup> Telemachos of Pharsalos in the fifth century killed an opponent in wrestling, and this is mentioned on the inscription which accompanied his statue, but nevertheless he was awarded a crown as victor.<sup>88</sup> On the other hand, Kleomedes of Astypalaia 'went mad with grief' after having been disqualified by the hellanodikai for killing an opponent in a boxing match at Olympia. He was convicted of 'foul play', not because he killed his opponent but for using a forbidden hold;<sup>89</sup> certain blows were forbidden at Olympia,<sup>90</sup> and a victory resulting from the fatal use of one of these was not counted.<sup>91</sup> Other athletes who lost the crown because of unfair blows were Diognetos and Damoxenos, and the deceased could be crowned as victor if he had been killed with an unfair blow.<sup>92</sup> In the late second century AD, Agathos Daimon, nicknamed 'Camel', from Alexandria in Egypt, who had won at Nemea, was killed in the boxing at Olympia; his epitaph states that he had prayed to Zeus for the wreath (that is, victory) or for death.<sup>93</sup>

Deaths, however, must have occurred at other sites, or on the journey to and from the site under a wide range of circumstances: old age, childbirth, disease, shipwreck and exhaustion could all have taken their toll. Competitors could be late for the Sebasta festival in Naples if they had been shipwrecked *en route*.<sup>94</sup> It is

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

not surprising, however, that there are no arrangements made for disposal of the dead in the lengthy Andanian cult inscription. This is probably not an indication that deaths were not anticipated at the site, but that they would be an abnormal occurrence, to be dealt with as and when necessary. There are cases of *theoroi* who died at Alexandria in Egypt while attending the *Ptolemaia*, as *hydria* funerary vases (which would have contained the ashes of the deceased) from an Alexandrian cemetery have inscriptions giving their names; in one case, a *theoros* was announcing a festival: 'Sotion son of Kleon, a Delphian *theoros*, (died) announcing the *Soteria*.'<sup>95</sup> No further information is available; what manner of death befell these *theoroi* while at Alexandria is unknown.

Little evidence is available for what happened in those cases where pilgrims became unexpectedly ill at a sacred site. The inscription from Parion in the Troad regarding the celebration of the *Panathenaia* at Ilium provides the information that a certain individual, appointed by the city of Parion to act as its *agoranomos* at Ilium had arranged for a doctor to take care of those who fell ill during the festival. The *synedrion* of the *koinon*, meeting at the *Panathenaic* celebration, decided to honour the *Parians* for making the appointment.<sup>96</sup> Who was eligible for treatment is only vaguely defined – 'those ill' – and the implication might well be that this was a service provided only for those actually participating in the contests associated with the festival, but it is also possible that he was appointed to look after the pilgrims generally. There is a case where a physician on Kos was honoured in the third century for taking care of travellers to Kos who fell ill on the island while on a *theoria* or on private business,<sup>97</sup> and the *theoria* is possibly a reference to an official visit to the *Koan Asklepieia*.

#### REGULATIONS FOR ATHLETES

Many regulations governed the activities of athletes. Competitors attending the Olympic festival had to be in training at Elis for thirty days before the festival, and then marched towards Olympia, being told by the *Eleians* that if they had trained well they could continue to their destination, but those who had not were to depart, to go wherever they chose.<sup>98</sup> Furthermore, once at Olympia the athletes had to swear that they had followed the regulations for training for a ten-month period. A similar injunction applied to the *hellanodikai*: they lived for ten months in the *hellanodikaion*

at Elis, where they were instructed about the contests.<sup>99</sup> Athletes could withdraw during the month of training, but not once they had been entered for the competition.<sup>100</sup> In the late second century AD one athlete, victorious in the pankration at Olympia, boasted that at other games some of his opponents withdrew as soon as he put his name down for competition, and others after the first or second draw (i.e. when they drew the lot to fight him in one of the heats before the final round).<sup>101</sup>

Athletes practised sexual abstinence. This was perhaps a purity requirement, as in other cults, but more probably a practical consideration, not so much as to instil discipline as to prevent 'dissipation of energy'. Ikkos of Tarentum avoided women and boys during training for the Olympics, winning the pentathlon in 444; Plato mentions other athletes who followed this practice. Athletes practised infibulation, the tying-down of the foreskin over the glans with a leather strip in order to protect the genitals; the penis could be tied up with the strip as well. The effect was known as the 'dog-tie' (*kynodesme*).<sup>102</sup> The diet of the athletes also came under scrutiny to ensure their physical fitness.<sup>103</sup>

The expenses, including the costs of training, which such athletes incurred seem to have been high, and were presumably an important factor in determining whether a good athlete would undertake an athletic pilgrimage to a panhellenic competition. Pindar notes that the costs involved in competing at Isthmia had not daunted the hopes of the competitors,<sup>104</sup> and presumably this was the case for the other athletic competitions as well. These expenses may to a large degree have been made up simply of sustenance, though competitors would have needed to be wealthy or, if poor, to have had a sponsor, for the visit to athletic sites involved a period in which the athletes could not earn a living. Even while they were not participating in the contests, they presumably spent a good deal of their time training. On the other hand, victory with the resulting emoluments would have helped to compensate for this. In a negative sense, fines to be paid by athletes for various misdemeanours would also have to be taken into account, and these would have been paid for from the pockets of the competitors themselves or their sponsors.

These fines were imposed for a variety of reasons. At the Olympics there were many misdemeanours for which competitors could incur fines, and the Eleians, through the official authorities, the *hellanodikai*, seem to have been fairly strict on a variety of matters

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

to do with the games. The competitors along with their fathers, brothers and trainers had to swear an oath upon slices of boar's flesh that they would not commit any wrongs at the festival, which shows the seriousness with which misconduct, especially bribery, was regarded.<sup>105</sup> It is probable that there were also similar fines for competitors breaking rules at the other panhellenic contests.

Pausanias describes how on the path to the stadium at Olympia there were several bronze statues of Zeus, called Zanes, which had been paid for from the fines inflicted on athletes who had broken Olympic regulations, and which had been erected as a permanent sign of their disgrace.<sup>106</sup> The first six of these related to the same crime, that of Eupolos of Thessaly, who at the 98th Olympics bribed the other three boxers to lose, one of whom was a previous Olympic winner. Four of these six statues had couplets inscribed on their bases. One was particularly instructive: to win at Olympia entailed 'not money but being quick-footed and strong'. Of the three others, one stated that it was erected 'out of respect for the god' and by the piety of the Eleians and to inspire fear in 'crooked athletes'; another praises Elis especially for fining the briber and the bribed; the last cautions that the statues have been set up to instruct Greece not to use bribery at the Olympic festival.<sup>107</sup>

Other cases of fines imposed for bribery are mentioned by Pausanias who himself saw the Zanes with the records of the relevant incidents.<sup>108</sup> Among these an interesting example is that of Kallippos of Athens, who bribed the other contestants in the pentathlon in 332. The Eleians fined both the briber and the bribed. The Athenians sent the orator Hypereides to persuade the Eleians to waive the fine, but they refused to change their minds, so the Athenians did not pay up, and boycotted the contests. However, at Delphi the god finally stated that he would give no oracle to the Athenians on any matter until Kallippos had paid the fine: they also had to pay for the erection of six statues, and as in the case of Eupolos inscriptions on the bases of the statues mentioned, along with other information, Apollo's approval of the Eleian decision, praises of the Eleians themselves, and the maxim that Olympic contests were about merit (*arete*) not money.<sup>109</sup> Bribery was also in evidence at other athletic centres, and at Epidauros three athletes were each fined 1,000 staters because they had 'corrupted' the contests, which is probably a reference to bribery.<sup>110</sup> Miller suggests that the numerous fragments (nearly 200) of a

bronze statue or statues near the entrance to the Nemean stadium may have been a statue or statues of victors, noting that at Olympia the Zanes were set up outside the entrance to the stadium, and that the statue fragments at Nemea might similarly represent fines for misdemeanours by athletes.<sup>111</sup>

An Alexandrian boxer Apollonios nicknamed 'Sprinkler' was fined in AD 93 (the 218th Olympic festival) because he was late for the official one-month training period at Elis which all competitors at the Olympic games had to undergo.<sup>112</sup> He gave as his excuse that the winds had held up the ship on which he was sailing, but was shown to be lying by another Alexandrian, Herakleides, the only boxer who had turned up on time, who proved that Apollonios had actually been competing and winning prizes in contests in Ionia. The Eleians therefore waived the contest and gave the prize to Herakleides, whereupon Apollonios attacked and pummelled him, despite the fact that Herakleides was wearing the olive wreath of victory and had taken refuge with the *hellanodikai*. Apollonios paid the price for his misconduct, though technically he was not a competitor, having arrived late, but rather was fined for a criminal misdemeanour.<sup>113</sup> One of the dangers which competitors could face was that of disqualification in a preliminary examination by the authorities in charge of an athletic event. At Isthmia there appears to be evidence for this procedure in a lead tablet which records that a magistrate disqualified one of the competitors. The text reads: 'I, Marios Tyrannos, disqualify Semakos.'<sup>114</sup>

There were rules governing the conduct of athletes in the actual competitions. A red-figure kylix from Athens shows two pankrationists fighting, one of whom is attempting to gouge out the eye of his opponent; a figure on the right, an umpire or trainer, raises his staff to beat him for breaking the rules.<sup>115</sup> On the night before the Battle of Salamis when the leaders of the Greek allies met, Themistokles broke into a speech before Eurybiades had a chance even to say what the meeting was about. Adeimantos commented that those who start too soon in the contests are flogged, to which Themistokles replied that those who wait too long are not crowned.<sup>116</sup> Clearly there were penalties for those who started before the other runners.

An early inscription at Olympia provided that wrestlers not break each other's fingers, whereas Pausanias records that Leontiskos of Messene (Sicily) was twice victorious at Olympia, winning

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

in the wrestling by bending his opponents' fingers, as he did not know how to throw his opponents; if there is to be no conflict between these two pieces of evidence, then Leontiskos is to be imagined as bending the fingers back painfully, but without breaking them. The inscription goes on to mention that breaking the fingers was to be punished by the *diaitater* (judge) by striking, except on the head.<sup>117</sup>

Further lines suggest that 'wrongdoers' could make compensation and compete at a subsequent Olympia, which is something the literary evidence confirms: misdemeanours at one Olympic festival did not rule out competing at subsequent celebrations (and certainly nothing in the evidence suggests that misdemeanours at one festival, such as the Pythia, disqualified participation at another, such as the Nemea). The word used in the Olympic inscription for wrongdoers, *mianteres*, means 'defilers' and evokes the religious nature of the festival. The fragmentary inscription also mentions deceit and injury, but the context is uncertain. Clearly these rules were a reflection, in the sixth century, of behaviour at the Olympic contests, otherwise they would not have been necessary. Cheating, bad behaviour and corruption were always to be a feature of the contests, which the authorities punished when detected.

Cowardice was also counted as a misdemeanour. One athlete, a pankrationist from Alexandria, was fined in AD 25 because on the day he was meant to compete he ran away; Pausanias notes that this was the only occurrence of such an incident. Theogenes was fined in 480 because he entered the boxing competition in order that Euthymos, who had won the contest in 484, would not be victorious in this event; Theogenes was successful but could not enter the pankration contest, as he had intended to do, as he was exhausted from the boxing. For his show of spite he was fined by the *hellanodikai*: 1 talent to Zeus and 1 to Euthymos. At the following Olympia Theogenes paid the god's fine, but in compensation to Euthymos refrained from entering the boxing, which Euthymos won in that year and also at the next Olympia.<sup>118</sup>

From the perspective of the home-state of a victor, competing for another state was a form of misconduct. That states honoured their victors indicates the importance which was attached to athletic victory and the honour which it brought to the city of the victor. Dikon, who had won victories in running at Delphi, Isthmia, Nemea and Olympia was proclaimed as a Caulonian (his

#### PILGRIMS AND PILGRIMAGE IN ANCIENT GREECE

Italian home-state) as a boy, but later was paid to proclaim himself a Syracusan. A state might pay a competitor to change his allegiance: Ephesos bribed Sotades of Crete, who had won a victory in the long race in 384 BC, to have himself proclaimed as an Ephesian when he competed in 380. He was banished by the Cretans. Astylos of Kroton, victorious in races at Olympia in three successive festivals, 484–476, had at first proclaimed himself a Krotonian but in the last two as a Syracusan, to please Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse. Kroton was, however, not pleased: his house was converted into a prison and a statue of him which had been placed in the temple of Hera was pulled down.<sup>119</sup>

The regulations for the Italian Sebastia at Naples, inscribed in the first or second century AD and set up at Olympia, presumably to encourage competitors at the Olympics to compete at Naples, contains several regulations about competitions.<sup>120</sup> These contests were 'isolympion'; that is, set up to be 'of the same nature' or 'ranking equal with the Olympics'. These were Greek contests modelled to an extent on Olympia (though there were also musical contests at the Sebastia), and there is overlap between the regulations at Naples and what is known of the competition rules at Olympia.

This inscription contains regulations about arriving late: athletes had to be present in Naples for thirty days before the festival, and give their father's name and home, and the competitions in which they wished to compete; a fine, and flogging for failure to pay the fine, are laid down for not registering correctly. The athletes were to train in the gymnasium. Legitimate reasons for lateness included illness, pirates and shipwreck. But anyone could inform against the competitor who, if found guilty (of a false excuse), could not take part. This seems to be precisely what Herakleides did to Apollonios at Olympia.

There was a financial allowance for the thirty days of training for the Naples 'Olympics' – 1 drachma for the first fifteen days, and then 2½ drachmas for the boys and youths, and 3 drachmas for the men. The inscription also provides for contests in which there were no competitors, or the result was a tie: the wreaths were to be dedicated in the gymnasium and inscribed with the name of the relevant contest. The degree to which these contests reflect practice at Olympia is difficult to assess. Certainly similar arrangements for lateness held. The financial inducements in the form of payments for the thirty days of training were not Olym-

#### ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

pian but would have been an attempt by the authorities at Naples to encourage attendance, while Olympia relied on its prestige to attract participants.

#### CONCLUSION

Sanctuaries such as Andania ensured that there were amenities for their pilgrims, but at Olympia conditions seem to have been primitive and the Eleians did not concern themselves with even rudimentary facilities. The sheer organisational necessity of maintaining order in the sanctuary inspired many of the regulations found in sacred laws. The many regulations to this effect indicate that the authorities considered that the sanctuaries were likely to suffer from large numbers of worshippers and their activities. The fact that there were regulations to ensure that they did not harm the natural environment and buildings of the sanctuary implies that many worshippers at sites must have shown little regard for the sanctuary, and only regulations and fines stood between the worshippers and the degradation through misuse of its trees and grounds. Athletes were the subject of many regulations, to ensure that they were fit to enter the contests, and because physical contests gave scope for cheating and bribery there were various laws against this. Festivals were religious occasions, but piety alone did not serve to control the behaviour of the worshippers at sacred sites who thronged to sanctuaries on an annual, biennial or pentetetic basis from throughout the Greek-speaking world.



## NOTES

Abbreviations for ancient authors and titles are as given in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* or *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. by H.G. Liddell, R. Scott & H.S.A. Jones, 1968, 9th edition, Oxford. The abbreviations for journals are as generally given in *L'année philologique*.

### INTRODUCTION

- 1 Dio Chrys. 8.9, 9.5.
- 2 Men. Rhet. 1.366.
- 3 Olympia: Diod. 18.8.5; Nemea: Miller (1990) 178.
- 4 Ar. *Frogs* 316–459; Hom. *Od.* 11 *passim*.
- 5 Modern scholars have no difficulty with the description ‘pilgrimage’: for example, B. Kötting (1950) *Pelegrinatio Religiosa*, Münster: 12–56.
- 6 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 79.13.
- 7 Athen. 172f.
- 8 Peace of Nikias: Thuc. 5.18.2; armistice: 4.118.1.
- 9 Diog. Laert. 8.8, cf. Luc. *Hdt.* 1; Iamb. *Pyth.* 12. 58; Epict. 2.14.23–25; Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 5.3.9.
- 10 Hdt. 8.26.2.
- 11 Plut. *Kleom.* 17.7.
- 12 Luc. *Hdt.* 2; Epict. 2.14.25.
- 13 Thuc. 5.18.2.
- 14 I. Rutgers (1862) *Sextus Africanus’ List of Olympian Victors*, Leiden; Paus. 5.8.6–7; cf. for Delphi: Kallisthenes *FGH* 124 T23.
- 15 Hom. *Od.* 6.162–67, 14.326; 16.403–05.
- 16 Thuc. 3.104.4–6.
- 17 Paus. 10.7.3.
- 18 A. Snodgrass (1980) *Archaic Greece*, Berkeley: 57; Morgan (1990) 30–34, 137–47, 192–94.
- 19 Cf. Fontenrose 268–312.
- 20 Cf. Snodgrass 57.
- 21 Hdt. 6.87–88; Thuc. 5.1.

## NOTES

### 1 OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

- 1 For sacred truces, see esp. Rougemont 75–106; Broderson 1–14; Dillon (1995) 250–54.
- 2 Cf. Foucart 268.
- 3 On theoroi and the theorodokia, note esp. Boesch 104–27; A. Salac (1940) *LF* 67: 100–15; H. Koller (1958) *Glotta* 36: 273–86; Bill 196–204, esp. 203; C. Michel (1919) *DA* 5: 208–11; L. Ziehen (1934) *RE* 5a: 2228–33, 2238–39, 2239–44; P. Charneux (1966) *BCH* 90: 168; Rougemont 89; Perlman 1–35; Dillon (1990) 70–76; Cole (1984) 48–56, esp. 53; Miller (1988) 148–49 with Perlman 126–258; for the architheoria, F. Cauer (1896) *RE* 2: 552–53; cf. Bruneau 93–114. Theoroi as local officials: U. Bultrighini (1941–43) *Annuario* 3–5: 141–51 and A.J. Graham (1982) *AncW* 5: 103–21 (cf. F. Salviat (1983) *BCH* 107: 181–87, and for Pergamon, L. Robert (1927) *REG* 40: 208–13). For Aeschylus' *Theoroi* (or *Isthmiastai*), see H.W. Smyth & H. Lloyd-Jones (1957) *Aeschylus*, vol. 2, London; D.F. Sutton (1981) *GRBS* 22: 335–38.
- 4 Cf. Weniger 197; *HCT* 3.667.
- 5 Cf. *HCT* 3.629; P. Cartledge (1985) in P.E. Easterling & J.V. Muir (eds) *Religion and Society*, Cambridge: 113; Harris 155–56.
- 6 Thuc. 4.119.3, 122.1, cf. 4.122.3, 5.1; cf. Luc. *Icaromen.* 33; Broderson 12 n. 49; cf. Pritchett (1971) 121 n. 27.
- 7 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 6B.8, 19, 28, 38–39; *SEG* 15, 90.9, cf. 11 (*Hesperia* 8 (1939) 5–7, no. 3; *GHI* 2.137; tr. Dillon & Garland 349–50); cf. Aesch. 2.133–34; Aristeid. *Orat.* 19.258; Poll. *Onom.* 1.36; Mosley 46, 88; A.B. Bosworth (1976) *AJAH* 1: 165; G.L. Cawkwell (1960) *REG* 73: 430–31; *SEG* 30, 61A.20, cf. 26).
- 8 Fifth-century dates: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 6B.17–27, 36–47 (taking ἀπὸ διχομενίας of 21–22, 41–42 as the 15th); cf. *SEG* 30, 61A.16–17 (heavily restored); Clinton (1980) 277.
- 9 *AE* (1914) p. 168, ll. 26–29 (Helly 2, no. 109, pp. 121–22); cf. Pritchett (1971) 121–24 n. 28; Rougemont 94–98.
- 10 As *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672 indicates; discussed below.
- 11 Spondai Olympiakai, see Aesch. 2.12; Dem. 19, hypoth. 2, para 3; Thuc. 5.49.1. Ekecheiria: Thuc. 5.49.3; Paus. 5.4.5, 5.20.1 (cf. 5.26.2, the deity Ekecheiria); Plut. *Lyk.* 1.2 (Arist. F533); Phlegon *FGH* 257 F1; cf. Weniger 215.
- 12 Plut. *Lyk.* 1.2; Paus. 5.4.5–6, 8.5, 20.1; 8.26.3–4; Phlegon *FGH* 257 F1; cf. Strabo 8.3.33; Weniger 184–89, 195.
- 13 For the hieromenia, see G.F. Unger (1875) *Philologus* 33: 227–48; Weniger 197; Rougemont 75–106, esp. 83–86; Parker (1983) 154–60; Olympia: Rougemont 88.
- 14 See below, pp. 34, 221–2.
- 15 Plut. *Mor.* 413d; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 643.7–8; Thuc. 5.1; on *FD* 3.4, 75.6–7, see Rougemont 86, 87 n. 42.
- 16 *LSCG* 78.44–49.
- 17 Thuc. 8.9.1, 10.1; cf. Paus. 5.2.1.

# NOTES

- 18 Plut. *Arat.* 28.6.
- 19 Pythia: *LSCG* 78.44; Nemea: Pind. *N.* 3.2; cf. Thuc. 3.56.2, 65.1 (Plataea); Miller (1975) 221 with n. 24.
- 20 Cf. Parker (1983) 155.
- 21 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 6B.17–47.
- 22 Aesch. 2.133–34.
- 23 *SEG* 15, 90.
- 24 Thuc. 5.49.1–50.2.
- 25 Thuc. 5.49.1, 5.
- 26 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 6B.27–36; cf. Rougemont 96–97.
- 27 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 78.24–26, 30–34; see B.D. Meritt (1945) *Hesperia* 14: 78; cf. Clinton (1980) 278 for a possible epigraphic reference to procedures in the case of infractions of the sacred truces.
- 28 *LSCG* 78.47–48.
- 29 Acceptances: *I. Magn.* 18–87; invitation decree: *I. Magn.* 16 (*FGH* 482 F2; cf. *I. Magn.* 17: *FGH* 482 F3).
- 30 Herzog & Klaffenbach 4–8; 10, 14–16.
- 31 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 590, 196 BC; Fontenrose (1988) 186–87; cf. *IvO* V 39.
- 32 There is a possible exception at Strabo 2.3.4.
- 33 For theoroi termed presbeutai, see *I. Magn.* 23; 31; 32; 36; 43; 54; 59; 61; 70; 72; 73; 80.
- 34 *AE* (1914) p. 168, ll. 35–37, cf. 26–29 (Helly 2, no. 109, pp. 121–22). For spondophoroi setting off in the first prytany of the political year (Hekatombaion and early Metageitnion), see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4; cf. Giovannini 54, n. 2.
- 35 Polyb. 28.19.4.
- 36 *IvO* V 36, 39.9.
- 37 Pind. *I.* 2.23–24; K. Latte (1929) *RE* 3a: 1848–49.
- 38 Paus. 5.15.10.
- 39 *FD* III 2, 140.14: σπονδο[φῶ] may indicate Delphic spondophoroi; Hesych. s.v. *hierangeloi*.
- 40 Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.3; cf. Thuc. 5.54.3; Pritchett (1971) 124; Parker (1983) 155 n. 59.
- 41 *SEG* 15, 90; Polyb. 28.19.4; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4; Aesch. 2.133–34; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 785.19–20 (for which, see L. Robert (1960) *Hellenica* 11–12: 107–08); cf. Foucart 268; Rougemont 98; Miller (1975) 219 n. 17.
- 42 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1126.13; Weniger 215; C. Michel (1911) *DA* 4.2: 1441.
- 43 *AE* (1914) p. 168, ll. 35–38; cf. Schweigert 10.
- 44 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1235; 1236; *SEG* 15, 90.12–13. Cf. W. Dittenberger (1885) *Hermes* 20: 229; Foucart 268–69.
- 45 Cf. G.L. Cawkwell (1960) *REG* 73: 430–31; Mosley 22.
- 46 Three spondophoroi, sons of theokoloi: *IvO* V 86; 91; 92; cf. 85, 89, 90; 95, 100; H.J. Tillyard (1905–06) *ABSA* 12: 471.
- 47 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1235; cf. *SEG* 30, 61A.1, 26; cf. on the hierophant's role in writing the epangelia, Clinton (1974) 23.
- 48 Foucart 268–69; Schweigert 10; Clinton (1974) 23, (1980) 275.
- 49 Cf. Weniger 215.
- 50 Herzog & Klaffenbach 1–16; *I. Magn.* 18–87.

# NOTES

- 51 Hesych. s.v. *theorikos*; Heraclid. Tar. ap. Erot. *Sosib.* 4: a stlengis (tiara) was worn by the theoroï sent to an oracle, or at a festival.
- 52 *IvO* V 414. For the herald's sceptre (kerykeion), note Hdt. 9.100.1; Thuc. 1.53.1 with schol. (cf. *HCT* 1.190); Dem. 51.13; Dein. 1.18; R. Boetzkas (1922) *RE* 11: 330–42; Mosley 85; G.W. Hornbostel (1988) 'Syrakusanische Herolde' in H. Buesing & F. Hiller (eds) *Bathron*, Saarbrücker: 233–45.
- 53 Hdt. 7.133.1–134.2; L. Wéry (1966) *AC* 35: 469–70, 479; Mosley 84, 87; J. Oehler (1922) *RE* 11: 349–57.
- 54 *SEG* 15, 90.13–14.
- 55 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4, 106–07, 227.
- 56 *AE* (1914) p. 168 (Helly 2, no. 109, pp. 121–22); cf. Clinton (1980) 276–77 on ephodia; see also below, p. 19.
- 57 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4, 106–07, 227.
- 58 Foucart 269; Mylonas 244.
- 59 *SEG* 30, 61A.4–7; sacrifice: 6; report: 23.
- 60 First prytany in 329/8 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4); tenth, final, prytany in 328/7 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.106–07); the third reference, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.227, is in an undated context.
- 61 Thuc. 5.49.1–50.1.
- 62 *SEG* 15, 90 (cf. P. Harding (1985) *From the Peloponnesian War to the Battle of Ipsus*, Cambridge: 54).
- 63 Schweigert 12; Rougemont 102.
- 64 Plut. *Arist.* 19.9; Weniger 217–18; cf. Boesch 101; G. Thomson (1943) *JHS* 63: 52–65; W.K. Pritchett (1957) *BCH* 81: 276–79, (1971) 125–26 n. 37; Rougemont 94.
- 65 Giovannini 54; Bill 196; Boesch 7–8, 105–27, esp. 105; Perlman x. Those who received the spondophoroi for the Olympic festival were known as theorodokoi: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 171.
- 66 Boesch 105–06; Perlman xv.
- 67 Herzog & Klaffenbach 38–42; 45; 72; 87; cf. 44; Boesch 9–10.
- 68 Herzog & Klaffenbach 13.32–33; 6.32, 50.
- 69 *I. Magn.* 33, esp. ll. 8, 23, 30–31.
- 70 Andoc. 4.30.
- 71 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 48–51, 94–96; *IG* V 390–94; *FD* 3.1.24; 3.1.86; *SEG* 26, 445; *I. Magn.* 50.51–52; cf. Perlman 19–20.
- 72 *AE* (1914) p. 168, ll. 8–9 (Helly 2, pp. 121–22, no. 109); cf. Perlman 18 with 27 n. 35.
- 73 *BCH* 105 (1981) 612–13 (*SEG* 31, 306).
- 74 General words, ἐλέσθαι ('to choose') and αἰδέωνται ('they are to choose'); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390.53–54, cf. 61–62; cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.26–30; *I. Magn.* 28.5; 35.32; 36.22; Athenians: *Hesperia* 6 (1937) pp. 448–50, no. 3.5–6, 23 (*SEG* 25, 108); Thelpoussa: Herzog & Klaffenbach 4.29–30; Chians: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.26–30, cf. 39.
- 75 Aetolians: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 629.23–24; Akarnanians: *I. Magn.* 31.30–34; for the Nikephoria, see M. Segre (1948) in L. Robert (ed.) *Hellenica* 5, Paris: 101–28; C.P. Jones (1974) *Chiron* 4: 183–205; for the Leukophryena, see O. Kern (1901) *Hermes* 36: 491–515; W. Kroll (1925) *RE* 12: 2287–88.

# NOTES

- 76 Aetolians and Delphians: *BCH* 77 (1953) 168–76 (*SEG* 12, 217); Antiochos: *I. Magn.* 18; the city: *I. Magn.* 33.30–31; *BCH* 45 (1921) p. 28, col. 5.27; cf. Perlman 2, 22 n. 4.
- 77 Boesch 122; Perlman 23–24. The Nemean list of theorodokoi includes a king, Nikokreon of Salamis: Miller (1988) 148, 153–54.
- 78 See, for example, *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 49; 50; 53; 60.
- 79 For proxenia, see C. Marek (1984) *Die Proxenie*, Frankfurt; M.B. Walbank (1978) *Athenian Proxemies of the Fifth Century BC*, Toronto; A. Gerolymatos (1986) *Espionage and Treason*, Amsterdam.
- 80 *Eur. Ion* 551, 1039.
- 81 *Luc. Syrian Goddess* 56.
- 82 Dillon (1990) 64–76.
- 83 Magnesian Leukophryena: *I. Magn.* 16–87; Kos: Herzog & Klaffenbach *passim*; Nesiotic league: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390, Athenian acceptance: *SEG* 28, 60.55–64 (270/69 BC); acceptance of the Soteria: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402, 408; cf. G. Nachtergaele (1975) *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes*, Brussels: 209–382, 391–519; acceptance of the Nikephoria at Pergamon: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 629, 630.
- 84 *I. Magn.* 72.
- 85 *I. Magn.* 37.19–20; 38.5; 43.8; 54.13 (and others).
- 86 *I. Magn.* 31.38; 32.33–34; 37.26–27; 50.36; 54.34–36.
- 87 Herzog & Klaffenbach 6.50–51, 8.8–10, 11.11, 12.27, 13.27–28.
- 88 R.K. Sinclair (1988) *Democracy and Political Participation in Athens*, Cambridge: 20–23, 114–19.
- 89 Choosing an architheoros: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.3; cf. Rhodes 626; Nikias: *Plut. Nik.* 3.5; Kallias: *SEG* 28, 60.57–58.
- 90 *Dem.* 19.128, 21.115.
- 91 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.26–30 (276 BC); cf. C. Champion (1995) *AJPh* 116: 213–20.
- 92 *Hdt.* 6.87.
- 93 Lists of theorodokoi exist for Delphi, Argos, Olympia, Epidauros, and Hermione (with selected *SEG*). Delphi: *BCH* (1921) 45: 1–85; *BCH* (1965) 89: 658–64; *AJPh* (1980) 101: 318–23 (*SEG* 26, 624; 30, 494); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 90 (*SEG* 25, 576); cf. L. Robert (1946) *BCH* 70: 506–23; G. Daux (1949) *REG* 62: 1–30. Argos (Nemean festival): P. Charneux (1966) *BCH* 90: 156–239, where note the maps of the locations of cities of theorodokoi on 171–91, also 710–14 (*SEG* 23, 189; 26, 427; 30, 361); cf. *BCH Suppl.* 6 (1980) 269–73, no. 4 (*SEG* 30, 357); *Hesperia* (1988) 57: 148–49. Olympia: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 171; cf. *IvO* V 39. Hermione (for the Chthonia): *IG* IV 727a; cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1051. Epidauros: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 94–95 (*SEG* 11, 410–411; 26, 447); *Hellenika* (1950) 8: 7–10 (*SEG* 11, 413); *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 96, a list of awards of theorodokia, functions as a list of theorodokoi.
- 94 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 94–95; P. Cabanes (1976) *L'Épire de la mort de Pyrrhos à la conquête Romaine*, Paris: 116–120 (note N.G.L. Hammond (1980) *CQ* 30: 473); Giovannini 52–62.
- 95 *Arist. Nik. Eth.* 1122a; *Lys.* 21.2 (seven trierarchies for 6 talents). For the architheoria as a liturgy at Athens, see Davies 37–38.
- 96 *Lys.* 21.5.

# NOTES

- 97 Delian festival: Plut. *Nik.* 3.5–6; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1635.34–35; cf. Rhodes 626; Nemea: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 365b (323 bc); *I. Priene* 174.26–27.
- 98 W.L. Westermann (1910) *CPh* 5: 203–16.
- 99 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.30–31, 38–39.
- 100 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390.57–59.
- 101 *SEG* 28, 60.55–64, with T.L. Shear (1978) *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 bc*, Princeton: 34.
- 102 Ekecheirion: *I. Magn.* 33 (as much as is given to those announcing the Pythia), 50; xenia and money from the city they are visiting to theoroi announcing a festival: Herzog & Klaffenbach 4 (money for the theoroi and for the god Asklepios); 5b; 6; 8 (xenia, and money for the aparche, first-fruits); 11.10–11 (3 minas for sacrifices, and xenia); 12.27–28; 13.27–33 (10 minas for the sacrifice and procession).
- 103 Aetolian League: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 629, esp. 15, 17, 26 (182 bc); cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1051.21–23; *I. Magn.* 40.18–19; Chersonasita: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 604 (192 bc).
- 104 Dem. 19.128.
- 105 Kos: groups of two theoroi: Herzog & Klaffenbach 6; 7; 12; 13; 16; groups of three: 4; 5a, b, 11; 15, see the list at Herzog & Klaffenbach pp. 28–30; Priene: *I. Priene* 5.10–11; Leukophryena: for example, *I. Magn.* 18–19; 31–38; 40; 41; 43; 44; 45.3–7.
- 106 Suda s.v. *theoroi*.
- 107 Aetolian League: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 629.21–22 (182 bc); Kos: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 398.21–25 (278 bc); Kallias: *SEG* 28, 60.62–64; Tyre: 2 *Macc.* 4.18–20; theoroi sacrificing: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.30; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390.55–56 (and they are to present a crown to Ptolemy, 57); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1051.14–17; *I. Priene* 5.11–13; *I. Magn.* 31.30–31; 32.29–31; 33.22–24; 35.25; 50.34–35; first-fruits: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 78.24–26, 30–34; *SEG* 30, 61B, a.13; cf. A.10; Clinton (1980) 276.
- 108 *I. Priene* 5.
- 109 *LSCG Suppl.* 38 a & b (fifth century bc; *SEG* 22, 444; G. Rougemont (1977) *BCH Suppl.* 4: 37–47; cf. G. Daux (1949) *Hesperia* 18: 68, (1949) *BCH* 73: 293); B. Jordan (1975) *The Athenian Navy*, Berkeley: 156–57.
- 110 Delos: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.3; Plut. *Thes.* 23.1; Sounion: Hdt. 6.87.
- 111 Exiles' Decree: Dein. 1.81; cf. Diod. 17.109.1, 18.8.2–7; Chians: Thuc. 8.9.1–10.2, esp. 10.1; cf. Popp 140–41; Salmon 337; Ptolemy: Polyb. 28.19.3–20.13; Cretan theoros: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 844.49–70 (after 200 bc); Lamian War?: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 365a, esp. 7–9; see Miller (1982) 100–08; A. Gerolymatos (1986) *Espionage and Treason*, Amsterdam: 80–82 (cf. *SEG* 21, 294; esp. 30, 66).
- 112 Aetolian League: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 629.22–23; Philippi: Herzog & Klaffenbach 6.53–54; see also *I. Magn.* 48.29–30; 53.68–70; 56.35–37; 82.15–16; 83.15–16 (largely restored); cf. Diod. 15.49.1–4; Megarians: Plut. *Mor.* 304e–f.
- 113 Argos: *BCH Suppl.* (1980) 6: 269–73, no. 4 (*SEG* 30, 357); cf. Miller (1988) 163 with n. 76; Samothrace, Parian theoroi: *SEG* 29, 797 (*Hesperia* (1979) 48: 26); P.M. Fraser (1960) *Samothrace* 2.1: The Inscriptions on Stone, New York: 52–53, no. 13, other theoroi: Cole (1984) 49–51 listing the relevant inscriptions, nearly all from *IG* XII.8

# NOTES

- and *Samothrace*, vol. 2.1, with map 2; Delphi: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 189; cf. *FD* 3.1.152; Olympia: *IvO* V 39.
- 114 For example, *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 629.29–30; *I. Magn.* 32.40–49; 33.24–26; 35.26–33; 48.20–21; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1051.17–20.
- 115 Tenos: Michel 392 (second century BC); cf. Perlman xv, 22–23.
- 116 Delphian Pythais: Ephoros *FGH* 70 F31b (Strabo 9.3.12, cf. 9.2.11); Is. 7.27; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 296, 696–699, 711, 728; *SEG* 25, 577–84; H.W. Parke (1939) *JHS* 59: 80–83, (1945) *CQ* 43: 106.
- 117 Hdt. 6.57.2, 4 (cf. 6.52.5); Xen. *Spartan Const.* 15.5; cf. R. Parker (1989) in A. Powell (ed.) *Classical Sparta*, London: 154–55; S. Hodkinson (1983) *Chiron* 13: 273 n. 105; Cartledge 34.
- 118 Delian Pythais: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2336 (102/1–98/7 BC); Hesych. s.v. ἀστροπὴ δι’ ἄρματος; A.W. Parsons (1943) *Hesperia* 12: 237 n. 121.
- 119 Plut. *Nik.* 3.5–6; Callim. *Hymn Del.* 314–15.
- 120 D. Peppas-Delmousou (1988) in R. Hägg *et al.* *Early Greek Cult Practice*, Stockholm: 255–58; cf. Jordan 156.
- 121 Sounion: Hdt. 6.87; Delphi: schol. Aristeid. *Panath.* 189.8. The scholiast, however, connects a yearly theoria, conducted by sea, with the Pythian festival, a penteteric event; the theoria to the four-yearly Pythian festival: Dem. 19.128.
- 122 Contra Jordan 156, on the basis of Suda s.v. *theoroi*.
- 123 Thuc. 8.10.1; Andoc. 1.132; Hellanikos *FGH* 323a F15; Andron *FGH* 10 F6.
- 124 Dem. 21.115; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 365a.7–8, b.3–8.
- 125 Andoc. 1.132; Dein. 1.81; Phot. s.v. *Paralos*; cf. Ar. *Wasps* 1382 where εἰθεώρουv might not mean in a capacity as theoros (contra Jordan 162 with n. 35), but in the sense of ‘viewing’ as at Thuc. 3.104.3, 5.18.2, 6.16.2; cf. Bill 200–01; S.D. Lambert (1986) *Historia* 35: 107–08.
- 126 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1642.14–15; Parke (1967b) 216–18; A.M. Woodward (1962) *ABSA* 57: 8–13.
- 127 *I. Magn.* 37.
- 128 Tetrapolis: Philochoros *FGH* 328 F75; Steph. Byz. s.v. *Tetrapolis*. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 541: Delphi grants promanteia and proedria to the tetrapolis; see also L. Ziehen (1934) *RE* 5a: 2231; Deubner (1932) 204; Jordan 162 n. 3; cf. E. Kearns (1985) in P.A. Cartledge & F.D. Harvey (eds), *Crux: Essays in Greek History Presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix*, London: 203. Acharnai: Parke & Wormell R281.
- 129 *SEG* 1, 366 (Samos); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390 (League of Islands); *SEG* 28, 60.55–64 (Athens).
- 130 B.F. Cook (1966) *Inscribed Hadra Vases*, New York: 25, no. 10, a theoros announcing the Delphian Soteria; Polyb. 28.19.4: Athenian theoriai announce the Panathenaia and the Mysteries.
- 131 Herzog & Klaffenbach 1–16, and see p. 30.
- 132 *I. Magn.* 16–87; the Dionysian technitai also accepted the invitation.
- 133 Fraser *Samothrace*, vol. 2.1, 62–73 (cf. 13–14); Cole (1984) 49–51, with 48–49, 51–56; compare the lists of mystai: Fraser 74–116; Cole 43–44.

## NOTES

### 2 THE SANCTITY OF GREEK PILGRIMS

- 1 *I. Magn.* 16; 25b; 31–39; 42–46; 48; 50; 52–54; 56; 58; 62; 63; 71–73; 85; cf. 57.
- 2 Herzog & Klaffenbach 2–16; *RC* 25–26 (explicitly stating that the asyilia applied both to the temple and to those who came to the temple); 27 (Welles' *RC* edition includes translations).
- 3 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 590 (Fontenrose (1988) 185–87, no. 10; c. 205–200 BC).
- 4 R.K. Sherck (1960) *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore: no. 40 (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 643; *FD* 3.4.75), with pp. 237–39 (cf. Rougemont 103), tr. in N. Lewis & M. Reinhold (1955) *Roman Civilization. Sourcebook I: The Republic*, Columbia: 184–85.
- 5 *Plut. Arat.* 28.5–6.
- 6 Epidauros: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 47; 49; 51; 53; 54; 58; for Delphi, see below, pp. 38–39.
- 7 *Plut. Arist.* 21.1–2; a victor in the contests: *IAG* 59 (20 BC).
- 8 See E. Schlesinger (1933) *Die griechische Asylie*, Giessen: 29–32.
- 9 For sleeping in sanctuaries, see below, pp. 150, 211; military attacks during festivals: Pritchett (1971) 125–26; cf. M.D. Goodman & A.J. Holladay (1986) *CQ* 36: 151–60.
- 10 For the sailing season, see esp. L. Casson (1971) *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*, Princeton: 270–73; cf. E.C. Semple (1932) *The Geography of the Mediterranean Region*, London: 579–80; F. Braudel (1966) *The Mediterranean*, vol. 1, 2nd edn, New York: 246, 248–53; S. Isager & M.H. Hansen (1975) *Aspects of Athenian Society in the Fourth Century BC*, Odense: 59–60, 85; Morgan (1990) 41–42; Casson (1991) 103, 105–07, 109, cf. 40, 65, 70, 100, (1994) 150.
- 11 B. Hemberg (1950) *Die Kabiren*, Uppsala: 108.
- 12 *Dem.* 33.23; E.E. Cohen (1973) *Ancient Athenian Maritime Courts*, Princeton: 9–10, cf. 12–59; Casson (1991) 109, 227; cf. Isager & Hansen 59–60, 85 who emend *Dem.* 33.23, but this is rejected by Cohen 12–59, and Rhodes 583.
- 13 *Plut. Per.* 11.4; cf. [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.19–20.
- 14 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1631.141–43.
- 15 *Dem.* 35.10; see Casson (1991) 105–07.
- 16 *Hes. Works and Days* 618–22, cf. 645; M.L. West (1978) *Hesiod. Works and Days*, Oxford: 314. These adverse winds are also described by *Hes. Theog.* 869, 872–80.
- 17 *Paus.* 5.21.12–14.
- 18 *Hes. Works and Days* 630–31 (wait for sailing season); 663 (for fifty days after the solstice), and, for this interpretation of ἡμέατα πεντήκοντα μετὰ τροπᾶς, rather than 'when fifty days have passed after the solstice', see West 322–23. This sailing season is from about June 21 to August 10 (J.H. Pryor (1988) *Geography, Technology, and War: Studies in the Maritime History of the Mediterranean 649–1571*, Oxford: 87).
- 19 *Hes. Works and Days* 663–77; 670: 'the winds are steady and the sea harmless'. Etesian winds: Pryor 19–20, 96–97.
- 20 *Hes. Works and Days* 673–686.



# NOTES

- 21 Morgan (1990) 41.
- 22 Olympia: Weniger 198–99; Epidauros: Them. *Or.* 27; cf. Kerényi (1960) 27; Delphi: Paus. 10.37.8.
- 23 Theoroi: Thuc. 6.3.1; Kos: *LSCG* 156b.13–19 (third century BC); Sicilian expedition: Thuc. 6.32.1–2; D. Wachsmuth (1967) *Pompimos ho Daimon*, Berlin: 319–26, esp. 320.
- 24 Plato *Phaed.* 58a–b.
- 25 Hdt. 6.87; see also 6.88–93. Most recently, T. Figueira (1988) *QUCC* 28: 49–87, cf. (1985) *AJPh* 106: 50, dates the Athenian–Aeginetan hostilities of Hdt. 6.87–93 *after* the First Persian War; see also A. Andrewes (1936–37) *ABSA* 37: 1–7, esp. 6–7; A.J. Podlecki (1976) *Historia* 25: 396–413, esp. 400–01. N.G.L. Hammond (1955) *Historia* 4: 406–11, and L. Jeffery (1962) *AJPh* 83: 44–54, accept Herodotos’ chronology.
- 26 Dem. 4.34; Androtion *FGH* 324 F24; Philochoros *FGH* 328 F47 (Harp. s.v. *hiera trieres*). For the date, see Jacoby *FGH* 3b *Suppl.* 1.141 (with *Suppl.* 2.130), who suggests 354/3; cf. 3b *Suppl.* 1.327–28; cf. Rhodes 687–88.
- 27 Aesch. 2.12–13; Dem. 19, hypoth. 2, para. 3. Modern scholars: note esp. Popp 138; Rougemont 83.
- 28 Dillon (1995) 250–54 (against E. Badian & J. Heskel (1987) *Phoenix* 41: 267).
- 29 Theoroi: Polyb. 28.19.4; monarchs: Herzog & Klaffenbach nos 1–3; *RC* 25; 26; 27; cf. 68; *I. Magn.* 18; 19; 23.
- 30 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 94.9 (*SEG* 11, 410).
- 31 *SEG* 15, 90.
- 32 Plato *Phaed.* 58a–b; Hesych. s.v. *theorikos*.
- 33 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1623.276–308; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 414a (see *Hesperia* (1940) 9: pp. 340–41 (*SEG* 21, 276)); Plut. *Mor.* 844a; cf. F.W. Mitchel (1970) *Lykourgan Athens*, Cincinnati: 32; C.J. Schwenk (1985) *Athens in the Age of Alexander*, Chicago: 134–36. For piracy, see J.J. Gabbert (1986) *G&R* 33: 156–63; P. McKechnie (1989) *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century*, London: 101–41; P. de Souza (1995) in A. Powell (ed.) *The Greek World*, London: 179–98.
- 34 *IvO* V 56.25 (first or second century AD).
- 35 *RC* 35.5–6 (R.S. Bagnall & P. Derow (1981) *Greek Historical Documents: The Hellenistic Period*, California: 209–10).
- 36 Thuc. 5.18.2.
- 37 Strabo 5.3.8. For Greek roads, see J.H. Young (1956) *Antiquity* 30: 94–97; R. Forbes (1965) *Studies in Ancient Technology*, vol. 2, Leiden: 140–44; Pritchett (1980) 143–96; Casson (1994) 68–72; O. Rackham (1990) in O. Murray & S. Price (eds) *The Greek City*, Oxford: 105–06; E.W. Kase *et al.* (1991) *The Great Isthmus Corridor Route*, Minnesota: *passim*, esp. plates.
- 38 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 79; cf. *LSCG Suppl.* 15.36; anaktoron destroyed by the Persians: Hdt. 9.65; cf. Mylonas 245–46; Clinton (1974) 14; Parke (1977) 59–60; Pritchett (1980) 173–74 n. 76.
- 39 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1191; *Anth. Pal.* 9.147; see also *APF* 11234.

# NOTES

- 40 See Paus. 1.36.3–38.7; see J. Travlos (1988) *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des Antiken Attika*, Tübingen: 177–90.
- 41 Decree of the Molpoi: *LSAM* 50.25–31 (*Milet* 1.3.133), 100 BC, see ch. 3 n. 192; hiera hodos: *Didyma II: Inschriften*, 40.11–12, 57.12–13, 280a.9; K.B. Gödecken (1986) *ZPE* 66: 217–53; P. Schneider (1987) *AA*: 101–29; N. Robertson (1987) *Phoenix* 41: 361, 363; Fontenrose (1988) 14, 28–29, 75.
- 42 A. Burford (1960) *Econ. Hist. Rev.* 13: 1–18.
- 43 O. Broneer (1973) *Isthmia*, vol. 2, Princeton: 3, 18; E.R. Gebhard in Coulson 73.
- 44 Livy 33.32; Pind. *O.* 9.86 describes the sanctuary as the gates of Corinth.
- 45 Land: Xen. *Mem.* 3.13.5; sea: Phot. s.v. *Paralos*; Dillon (1995) 253 n. 20 (cf. Menander Rhetor 1.336–67, with D.A. Russell & N.G. Wilson (1981) *Menander Rhetor*, Oxford: 270).
- 46 Hdt. 2.7.1; the altar was also used to measure the distance to the Piraeus: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1092 bis (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2640); *CEG* I.442; cf. G.V. Lalonde et al. (1991) *The Athenian Agora XIX. Inscriptions*, Princeton: 14; Dillon & Garland 107.
- 47 C. Müller (1855) *Geographi Graeci Minores*, vol. 1, Paris: Dikaiarchos, p. 100.
- 48 Tr. W.S. Ferguson (1911) *Hellenistic Athens*, London: 263 (cf. 261–62), 464–65; cf. M. Rostovtzeff (1941) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford: 1.211, 3.1369 n. 36; Pritchett (1980) 192–93.
- 49 Plato *Laws* 918d–919a.
- 50 Thuc. 7.28.1.
- 51 Paus. 10.5.3–5; Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 800–03; Forbes 143.
- 52 Strabo 9.3.3.
- 53 Amphictyonic law: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1126.40–43; Forbes 143; Pritchett (1980) 147; Pythais: ch. 1 n. 116; horos: R.E. Wycherley (1957) *Agora*, vol. 3, Princeton: 224, no. 730; cf. A.W. Parsons (1943) *Hesperia* 12: 237–38; Hdt. 6.34.2; Thyiades: Paus. 10.4.3; Plut. *Mor.* 365a; Kirrha: Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.26.
- 54 Plut. *Mor.* 304e; W.R. Halliday (1928) *The Greek Questions of Plutarch*, Oxford: 219–220; N.G.L. Hammond (1954) *ABSA* 49: 118–20; cf. Pritchett (1980) 190.
- 55 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iama 33. Cf. Paus. 2.10.3; note the carving of a sick individual carried on a litter experiencing an epiphany of Asklepios: Siefert Abb. 3.
- 56 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iama 25.
- 57 Thuc. 5.1 (cf. 5.2); cf. *HCT* 3.629; Popp 139.
- 58 Thuc. 5.18.2; cf. *HCT* 3.667.
- 59 Borrowing of money: Thuc. 1.121.3, 1.143.1, cf. 4.118.3; Parker (1983) 174 n. 171; S. Hornblower (1991) *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1, Oxford: 229; assemble at Delphi: Thuc. 3.101.1.
- 60 Thuc. 4.118.1–2 (423), 5.18.2 (421).
- 61 Thuc. 4.118.1; Phokians as Spartan allies in the Peloponnesian War:

# NOTES

- Thuc. 2.9.2; Delphi approved the Spartan declaration of war: Thuc. 1.118.3, 2.54.4–5.
- 62 Sicilian expedition: Plut. *Nik.* 13.2, 14.7; Parke (1967a) 109–11, (1967b) 216–17; R. Garland (1990) in M. Beard & J. North (eds) *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, London: 89; Kimon: Plut. *Kim.* 18.7–8.
- 63 The oracle at Dodona sanctioned the establishment of a state cult to Bendis: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 (third century BC); decree relating to the state cult: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136 (413/2?); her name appears in *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 383.143 (429/8); Parke (1967a) 110, (1967b) 149–50, 216, 218; J.D. Mikalson (1983) *Athenian Popular Religion*, Chapel Hill: 71, 126 n. 3; R. Garland (1987) *The Piraeus*, London: 118–21, (1990) 85, 89, (1992) *Introducing New Gods*, London: 21, 111–14; R. Simms (1988) *AncW* 18: 59–76; Hornblower 286–87.
- 64 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 73.
- 65 *HCT* 2.414; Chios: Thuc. 8.10.1.
- 66 Plut. *Ages.* 18.1–19.4.
- 67 Aristeid. *Orat.* 19.258.
- 68 Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.29–35; Isoc. 4.126; Polyb. 4.27.2–4; Diod. 16.23.2; Plut. *Ages.* 23.6–7, *Pelop.* 5.2–3, *Mor.* 575f–576a; Nepos *Pelop.* 1.
- 69 Cf. Rougemont 105–06.
- 70 Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.12, 20–21; Plut. *Alk.* 33.2–34.7; cf. Thuc. 6.91.6–6.93.2, 7.19.1, 7.20.1, 7.27.2–5; Alkibiades' procession: D. Kagan (1987) *The Fall of the Athenian Empire*, Ithaca: 290–91; W.M. Ellis (1989) *Alcibiades*, London: 89–90.
- 71 Cf. Clinton (1980) 275.
- 72 Arr. *Anab.* 1.10.2 (not stating that the procession of the 19th was in progress and had to be stopped, contra Mylonas 257).
- 73 Thuc. 8.9.1.
- 74 Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.1–2; cf. Plut. *Ages.* 21.3–6; Paus. 3.10.1; M. Whitby (1984) *Historia* 33: 297–98; cf. G.T. Griffith (1950) *Historia* 1: 236–56.
- 75 Eleians: Parker (1983) 155 n. 58; Cartledge 223; Isthmia: Paus. 2.2.2.
- 76 Pheidon: Hdt. 6.127.3; 480: 8.26.2.
- 77 Thuc. 5.31.1–5, 5.49.1. For the incident in 420, see Popp 127–32; Rougemont 94–98, 102; Sordi 20–23; *HCT* 4.65.
- 78 Thuc. 5.49.3.
- 79 Elis: Thuc. 5.49.5, 50.2; 332: ch. 8 n. 109. Note also the Athenian boycott of the Pythian festival (Dem. 19.128; 346 BC). Peisistratos, tyrant of Athens, and his sons, are sometimes said to have boycotted the Delphic oracle (e.g., Parker (1985) 325 n. 93; H.A. Shapiro (1989) *Art and Cult under the Tyrants*, Mainz: 49–50) but the arguments are not compelling; however, the oracle played a key role in 514, when the priestess was bribed, in bringing about the downfall of the tyrants: Hdt. 5.63.1; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 19.4.
- 80 Thuc. 5.50.3; Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.21; *HCT* 4.66; Athenian cavalry: G.R. Bugh (1988) *The Horsemen of Athens*, Princeton: 95–96.
- 81 Thuc. 5.50.4; Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.21; Paus. 6.2.2–3; *HCT* 4.67.
- 82 Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.23–31; Paus. 3.8.3–6, 6.2.2–3; Diod. 14.17.4–12, 14.34.1; cf. Popp 132–34; Sordi 23–25; R.K. Unz (1986) *GRBS* 27: 29–42.

# NOTES

- 83 Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.12–32; Diod. 15.78.1–3; cf. Popp 135–37; Sordi 28.
- 84 Plut. *Demetr.* 40.7–8.
- 85 Diod. 14.109.1–3; Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 29–30; *Lys.* 33; Plut. *Mor.* 836d.
- 86 Plut. *Them.* 25.1; F.J. Frost (1980) *Plutarch's Themistokles: A Historical Commentary*, Princeton: 206.
- 87 Salmon 339–40.
- 88 Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.2–3 (388 or 387 BC); cf. 5.1.29; Pritchett (1971) 124–25; Parker (1983) 155–56; Parke (1967b) 187.
- 89 Thuc. 5.54.3; Pritchett (1971) 122, 124; Parker (1983) 155 n. 59.
- 90 Paus. 9.36.2–3.
- 91 The sources write of the (Second) *Sacred War*: Thuc. 1.112.5; Plut. *Per.* 21.1; (Third) *Sacred War*: Paus. 9.6.4; Diod. 16.23.1; see also Aesch. 3.148; Strabo 9.3.8; Paus. 8.27.9, 10.3.1, 10.13.6; cf. Broderson 7–9.
- 92 Strabo 9.3.4; Aesch. 3.107–12; Diod. 9.16; Paus. 10.37.5–8, cf. 2.9.6; *LSCG* 78.15–21; Parke & Wormell 1.99–113; W.G. Forrest (1956) *BCH* 80: 33–52; J. Boardman & H.W. Parke (1957) *JHS* 77: 276–82; Broderson 3–7; K. Tausend (1992) *Amphiktyonie und Symmachie*, Stuttgart: 34–47.
- 93 N. Robertson (1978) *CQ* 28: 49–66 argues that there was no First Sacred War, criticised by G.A. Lehmann (1980) *Historia* 29: 242–46 (who notes Isoc. 14.31); K. Tausend (1986) *RSDA* 16: 49–66; V. Parker (1994) *Hermes* 122: 412–13; J.K. Davies (1994) in S. Hornblower (ed.) *Greek Historiography*, Oxford: 193–212.
- 94 Thuc. 1.112.5; Plut. *Per.* 21; Strabo 9.3.15; Philochoros *FGH* 328 F34; cf. Parke & Wormell 1.185–86.
- 95 Diod. 16.14–60; Paus. 9.6.4, 10.2.1–10.3.1, 10.15.1; Just. 8.1.8–2.12; Parke & Wormell 1.216–32; Parke (1967a) 115; J.R. Ellis (1976) *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism*, London: 73–75; J. Buckler (1989) *Philip II and the Sacred War*, Leiden: *passim* (esp. 7 on the Delphic Amphictyony); R. Sealey (1976) *A History of the Greek City States*, Berkeley: 463–68.
- 96 Aesch. 3.113–24; Dem. 18.143; Ellis 186–90, 290 n. 31; Parke & Wormell 1.236–38; P. Londev (1990) *Chiron* 20: 239–60.
- 97 Hdt. 8.36.1–39.2, cf. 9.42.3–4; Parke & Wormell R97–98.
- 98 Paus. 10.22.12–10.23.14.
- 99 Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.29–31.
- 100 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 643.
- 101 Paus. 10.7.1; cf. Strabo 9.3.7–8.
- 102 Plut. *Arat.* 28.5–6; F.W. Walbank (1933) *Aratos of Sikyon*, Cambridge: 60–61, 186–87.
- 103 Diod. 11.65.2; hyp. Pind. *N.* c, d (Drachmann III.3.17, 5.3); Adshead (1986) 72–76, 98; D.M. Lewis (1981) in G.S. Shrimpton & D.J. McCargar (eds) *Classical Contributions*, New York: 74–75.
- 104 For the disputed control of the Nemean festival, see Miller (1982) 100–08, (1989) 89, (1990) 23, 43, 57–62, 130; Stella G. Miller in Raschke 145; cf. D.W. Bradeen (1966) *Hesperia* 35: 326.
- 105 Plut. *Kleom.* 17.7.

## NOTES

- 106 Plut. *Mor.* 304e–f; R.P. Legon (1981) *Megara*, Ithaca: 131–33, dating the ‘unbridled democracy’ to c. 600–580.
- 107 *I. Ephes.* 2; see D. Knibbe (1961–63) *Jahrshefte Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 46/116: 175–82; F. Sokolowski (1965) *HTbR* 58: 427–31; L. Robert (1967) *RPh* 41: 32–36; O. Masson (1987) *REG* 100: 225–39.
- 108 Hermippos *FHG* F48.
- 109 Herzog & Klaffenbach 6.52–54.
- 110 Diod. 15.49.1–4; see below, p. 131.
- 111 Paus. 2.15.1.
- 112 R.K. Sherck (1960) *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore: no. 23, cf. nos 55, 57, 69.
- 113 Tac. *Ann.* 3.60–63; cf. G.G. Belloni (1984) in M. Sordi (ed.) *I Santuari e la Guerra nel Mondo Classico*, Milan: 164–80.

## 3 MYSTERY CULTS, HEALING SANCTUARIES AND ORACLES

- 1 Cic. *Leg.* 2.14.36.
- 2 Commentaries on the hymn: F. Wehrli (1934) *ARW*: 77–104; G.E. Mylonas (1942) *The Hymn to Demeter and her Sanctuary at Eleusis*, Washington; F.R. Walton (1952) *HTbR* 45: 105–14; Richardson (1974); cf. R. Parker (1991) *G&R* 38: 1–17; K. Clinton (1986) *OpAth.* 16: 43–49, and (1992) *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Stockholm: 28–37.
- 3 But cf. K. Clinton (1971) *AE*: 91–92.
- 4 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 5, c. 500 BC; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 54.7; Pind. *O.* 9.99, 13.110, *I.* 1.57.
- 5 Dates: Plut. *Demetr.* 26.1–5; Polyain. *Strat.* 5.17; schol. Plato *Gorg.* 497c; schol. Ar. *Wealth* 845; dates: Mylonas 239 n. 80; Mikalson 120–21 tentatively suggests Anthesterion 20–26 for the festival; Agrai: Steph. Byz. s.v. *Agra kai Agrai*; for general details, see Mylonas 239–43; Kerényi (1967) 48–52; D. Lauenstein (1987) *Die Mysterien von Eleusis*, Stuttgart: 127–54; cf. Burkert (1983) 249–50 with n. 7.
- 6 S. Dow (1937) *HSCP* 48: 112–16; Mikalson 54–60.
- 7 Ephebes: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1078.9–15 (c. AD 220): in accordance with ‘ancient usage’ (10–11), accepted by J. Harrison (1922) *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 3rd edn, Cambridge: 151; but note Mylonas 246; cf. Mikalson 54; presumably the practice commenced with the creation of the ephebeia in the fourth century; bridge: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 79 (c. 421); kistai: Plut. *Phok.* 28.5; the caryatids of the Lesser Propylaea at Eleusis carry kistai on their heads; cf. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 79.9–11.
- 8 Agyrhmos: Hesych. s.v. *agyrhmos*. The ‘To the sea, mystai!’ is known to have been the second day and occurred on the 16th (Polyain. *Strat.* 3.11.2), making the 15th the first day; cf. Mikalson 55; officials: Clinton (1974) 10–68, 76–82; those excluded: Isoc. 4.157; see also Suet. *Nero* 34.4; Dio Chrys. 17.5; Luc. *Demon.* 34; Ar. *Frogs* 369–70

# NOTES

- with schol.; Theo. Smyrn. 14.20–25; Philostr. *Apoll.* 4.18; Orig. *Cels.* 3.59; Liban. *Decl.* 13.19, 52.
- 9 Sopat. *Rhet. Gr.* 8.110.
- 10 Hesych. s.v. *halade mystai*; *IG* II<sup>3</sup> 847.20; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 84.35–36. EM s.v. *hiera hodos*, confuses this with the sacred road to Eleusis; schol. Aesch. 3.130.
- 11 The sacrifice of the pig: Ar. *Frogs* 337–38, *Peace* 374–75 (with schol.); Epicharmos *Od. Aut.* F100 (Kaibel); Ar. *Ach.* 729–835, esp. 747, 764; Plut. *Phok.* 28.6 (322 BC); Aesch. 3.130 with schol.
- 12 Plato *Rep.* 378a; cf. Harrison 16.
- 13 Philostr. *Apoll.* 4.18; Foucart 317–23; Deubner (1932) 72; S. Dow (1937) *HSCPh* 48: 113; Mikalson 56; K. Clinton (1994) in R. Hägg (ed.) *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphic Evidence*, Stockholm: 17–34.
- 14 [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.4; Paus. 2.26.8; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 974.11–16.
- 15 Philostr. *Apoll.* 4.18; cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4960a.
- 16 For the procession, see *LSCG Suppl.* 15; D. Lauenstein (1987) *Die Mysterien von Eleusis*, Stuttgart: 164–81; Mylonas 252–58; Parke (1977) 65–67; Burkert (1983) 277–80, (1985) 286–87.
- 17 For the date, see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1078.18–22. See Mikalson 59 for Plut. *Phok.* 28.2, *Cam.* 19.10, with Eur. *Ion* 1076, which give the 20th for the night festival: the procession did not arrive at Eleusis until sunset, and according to Greek practice the day began at sunset, so that the procession arrived on the 20th. For an alternative chronology of these days, see K. Clinton (1993) in N. Marinatos & R. Hägg (eds) *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London: 116–19. The 21st was presumably a day of rest.
- 18 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1078.18–22.
- 19 Hdt. 8.65.1; Plut. *Arist.* 27.4, *Them.* 15.1; Paus. 1.2.4; Ar. *Frogs* 324; Poll. *Onom.* 1.35.
- 20 Hdt. 8.65.1–6; Plut. *Them.* 15.1, *Phok.* 28.1–2; cf. Poseidonios *FGH* 87 F36 (#51); Luc. *Demon.* 11.
- 21 Hdt. 5.97.2 gives 30,000 as the number of male Athenian citizens.
- 22 Luc. *Demon.* 11; cf. Hdt. 8.65.4; Cic. *Nature of the Gods* 1.42.119.
- 23 Ar. *Frogs* 316–17, 325, 341.
- 24 Lykourgos: ch. 8 n. 44; Niinnion tablet: cf. Simon 32 n. 56. Distinct from this are the bunches of twigs which mystai carried: Hesych. s.v. *Bakchos*; schol. Ar. *Knights* 408; Serv. *Aen.* 6.136; cf. W. Burkert (1979) *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Berkeley: 43–44.
- 25 Ar. *Frogs* 330 with schol.
- 26 Paus. 1.36.3; Polemon wrote a lost work on the sacred procession (F10d, p. 44 = Harp. s.v. *hiera hodos*).
- 27 Phot. s.v. *krokoun*; Paus. 1.38.2; Hesych. s.v. *Rheitoi*.
- 28 Hesych. s.v. *gephyris*, *gephyristai*, placing the gephyrismos on the Eleusinian Kephisos; Strabo 9.1.24 on the Athenian Kephisos; cf. Ar. *Wasps* 1363 with schol. 1361.
- 29 C. Kerényi (1960) *Symb. Osl.*: 11–16.
- 30 Diod. 5.4.7.

# NOTES

- 31 For Ar. *Wasps* 1361–63 (with schol. 1361) as a reference to this ritual, see J.S. Rusten (1977) *HSCPb* 81: 158; R.M. Rosen (1987) *AJPh* 108: 421.
- 32 But cf. Burkert (1987) 74–75.
- 33 Plut. F60 (Sandbach).
- 34 Clem. *Protrep.* 2.18.
- 35 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 49–50, 129, 200, 304; cf. Callim. *Hymn Dem.* 6, 12 (with Richardson (1974) 213; N. Hopkinson (1984) *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter*, Cambridge: 35–39).
- 36 Ovid *Fasti* 4.535–36.
- 37 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 207–08.
- 38 The hierophant underwent temporary castration by using herbs or hemlock: Hippol. *Ref.* 5.8.40; Hieron. *Adv. Iov.* 1.49; schol. Pers. 5.145; Serv. *Aen.* 6.661; Orig. *Cels.* 7.48; Jul. *Or.* 5.173d; cf. Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 25.95.154; Stobaios 4, p. 73; Clinton (1974) 116; Paus. 2.14.1 should be taken as implying that hierophants could marry (cf. Burkert (1983) 284 n. 46).
- 39 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 208–09; glechon (blechon) is translated as penny-royal or soft mint; on opium, see Richardson (1974) 345 (cf. 344–48); Burkert (1987) 108–09; R.M. Rosen (1987) *AJPh* 108: 416 n. 4; fermented barley grain inducing hallucinations: Kerényi (1967) 178–80; C. Watkins (1978) *PAPA* 122.1: 9–17; R.G. Wasson *et al.* (1978) *The Road to Eleusis*, New York: *passim*, esp. 37–50 (47: ‘the likely psychotropic ingredient’); cf. R.G. Wasson *et al.* (1986) *Persephone’s Quest. Entheogens and the Origins of Religion*, New Haven; see also A. Delatte (1955) *Le Cycéon*, Paris.
- 40 Mylonas 287–316, esp. 287–88, note 263; C. Kerényi (1962) *Die Mysterien von Eleusis*, Zürich: 107–12, (1967) 116–19; but cf. Burkert (1983) 251.
- 41 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 47–48, 61, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 81e; Lact. *Inst. Epit.* 18.23.7, *Div. Inst.* 1.21.24; Tert. *Ad. Nat.* 2.7; Clem. *Protrep.* 2.12 (cf. Minuc. *Felix Octav.* 22.2; Liban. *Decl.* 14.31); Mylonas 261–65; Kern (1927) 75–76; Foucart 392; Farnell 3.175; Burkert (1983) 275–76; note esp. K. Clinton (1992) *Myth and Cult*, Stockholm: 84–90, (1993) in N. Marinatos & R. Hägg (eds) *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London: 115, 118.
- 42 See P. Roussel (1930) *BCH* 54: 58–65; bibliography at Burkert (1983) 267 n. 12. Three scenes are represented on both the urn and the sarcophagus.
- 43 Diod. 4.14.3; Apollod. 2.5.12; Plut. *Thes.* 30.5; Lesser: Mylonas 208; Kerényi (1967) 52–59; Richardson (1974) 22; Greater: Burkert (1983) 267–68.
- 44 Hesych. s.v. *thronosis*.
- 45 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 47–48, 61.
- 46 Hearing: Sopat. *Rhet. Gr.* 8.110; [Lys.] 6.51; sight: Antiphilos: *Anth. Pal.* 9.298; a votive found at Eleusis records that Demeter cured Eukrates, and the pair of eyes on the relief suggest that the cure was ophthalmological (Clinton (1992) 209 fig. 78). See also Andoc. 1.31.
- 47 Proklos *Diadochos in Alkib.* 1.5, p. 288.

# NOTES

- 48 Arist. F15 (Rose).
- 49 [Lysias] 6.51.
- 50 Plut. *Mor.* 81d–e; Max. Tyr. 39.3k.
- 51 Dio Chrys. 12.33; Plut. *Them.* 15.1.
- 52 Clem. *Protrep.* 2.18; cf. Arnob. 5.26.
- 53 Clem. *Protrep.* 2.19.
- 54 Mylonas 300–01; Clinton (1974) 8; cf. Burkert (1987) 37, 147 n. 44.
- 55 *Protrep.* 12.92: 'the Lord is hierophant'; at 2.19 it is stated that the mysteries involve female genitalia.
- 56 Diod. 5.4.4.
- 57 Tert. *Valent.* 1.
- 58 Asterios *Hom.* 10; cf. Hippol. *Ref.* 5.8.40 (the birth of a sacred child, Brimo).
- 59 Porph. *Abst.* 2.6; Burkert (1983) 272–73, (1985) 286.
- 60 Isoc. 4.28–29; for Triptolemos: Paus. 1.14.2; *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 477; Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.6; cf. Plut. *Kim.* 10.7. The boy depicted in the great relief at Eleusis between two female figures, probably Persephone and Demeter, is often taken to be Triptolemos (Mylonas pl. 68).
- 61 Hippol. *Ref.* 5.8.39–40.
- 62 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 480–82; Soph. F837 (Pearson); Diogenes: Plut. *Mor.* 21f; Jul. *Or.* 7.238a; Diog. Laert. 6.39 (Jul. and Diog. mention Agesilaos); cf. Plut. *Mor.* 761f; Pindar: F121 (Bowra).
- 63 Achilles: *Hom. Od.* 11. 489–91; Odysseus consults the dead: *Od.* 11.123–635; Menelaos: *Od.* 4. 561–69; Islands of the Blessed: the Athenian tyrannicides Harmodios and Aristogeiton, Athen. 695b; cf. Hes. *Works and Days* 170–73, Pind. *O.* 2.68–77; initiates: Ar. *Frogs* 340–416; a better life: Isoc. 4.28; *Anth. Pal.* 11.42.
- 64 Note P. Darcque (1981) *BCH* 105: 593–605 (arguing that the Mycenaean building under the anaktoron was not its predecessor).
- 65 Plemochoi: Athen. 496a–b; Hesych. s.v. *Plemochoe*; Poll. *Onom.* 10.74; K. Clinton (1992) *Myth and Cult*, Stockholm: 74; boule: Andoc. 1.111; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 848.27–32 (S. Dow (1937) *Prytaneis*, Princeton: 81–85, no. 36), cf. 1072; Travlos 198; P.J. Rhodes (1972) *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford: 35.
- 66 'Mirthless Rock': Apollod. 1.5.1; Suda s.v. *Salaminos*; Ovid *Fasti* 4.502–04; artistic evidence: esp. I.K. & A.E. Raubitschek (1982) *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture, and Topography Presented to H.A. Thompson*, Princeton: 115–17 (the Stanford crater); Clinton (1992) 14–27; Kallichoron Well: *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 98–100, 272; Clinton 27–28; cave: esp. Clinton 18–27.
- 67 For whom, below, p. 272, n. 63.
- 68 Valentinian: Zos. *NH* 4.3.2–3; Eunapios *Lives of the Sophists* 7.3.
- 69 Fourth century: Cole (1984) 16–20, cf. 11; Burkert (1985) 282; Hdt. 2.51; Ar. *Peace* 277–78. For Samothrace, see K. Lehmann (1975) *Samothrace*, 4th edn, New York; Cole (1984), (1989) *ANRW* 2, 18.2: 1564–98; H. Ehrhardt (1985) *Samothrake*, Stuttgart.
- 70 Cole (1984) 43–44, with map 1, listing the relevant inscriptions; nearly all are from *IG* XII.8 and P.M. Fraser (1960) *Samothrace* 2.1: *The Inscriptions on Stone*, New York; Plut. *Mor.* 217c–d, 229d.



# NOTES

- 71 See the discussion and bibliography at Cole (1984) 104 n. 10, 107–08 n. 79.
- 72 Demetrios of Skepsis taking issue with Stesimbrotos (*FGH* 107 F20); Hdt. 2.51.2 also refers to the Samothracian gods as the Kabeiroi; cf. B. Hemberg (1950) *Die Kabiren*, Uppsala: 73–81; Cole (1984) 2.
- 73 Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1.917.
- 74 See the discussion of Cole (1984) 2–4.
- 75 Varro *De Ling. Lat.* 5.10.58; Hdt. 2.51.4; Hippol. *Ref.* 5.8.9–10 (statues and fertility rites).
- 76 Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 1.918; cf. Hom. *Od.* 5.333–62.
- 77 Iron rings in sanctuary: Hemberg 110; lodestone: EM s.v. *magnetis*; Lucr. 6.1044; Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 33.1.23; Isidoros *Etym.* 19.32.5; photo at Ehrhardt 180; Lehmann 26.
- 78 *LSCG Suppl.* 75 (first century BC), 75a (second century AD, in Latin, followed by Greek; Fraser (1960) *Samothrace*, 2.1: nos 62, 63).
- 79 Livy 45.5.4.
- 80 Plut. *Mor.* 217c–d, 229d, 236d (the last presumably referring to the Samothracian Mysteries); cf. W. Burkert (1993) in N. Marinatos & R. Hägg (eds) *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London: 184.
- 81 Val. Flacc. *Arg.* 2.440–41.
- 82 Fraser (1960) *Samothrace*, 2.1: no. 36, with commentary.
- 83 Cole (1984) 26–27.
- 84 Cic. *Nature of the Gods* 3.89; cf. van Straten (1981) 78 with n. 62.
- 85 Epaminondas: Paus. 4.26.7–27.5; Mnasiistratos: *LSCG* 65.11–12; cf. Paus. 4.3.10, 14.1, 15.7, 16.2, 4.33.5; silence: Paus. 4.33.4, cf. *LSCG* 65.4; kistai: *LSCG* 65.29–30. For the Andanian Mysteries, see H. Sauppe (1860) *Die Mysterieninschrift aus Andania*, Göttingen; C.T. Newton (1880) *Essays on Art and Archaeology*, London: 177–84; Kern (1938) 3.188–90; *LSCG* 65: tr. M.W. Meyer (1987) *The Ancient Mysteries*, San Francisco: 51–59; cf. Grant 31–32; N. Robertson (1988) *GRBS* 29: 246–54.
- 86 Paus. 8.37; cult regulations: *LSCG* 68, and a new fragment of another sacred Lykosouran law: A.P. Matthaiou & Y.A. Pikoulas (1986) *Horos* 4: 75–78 (second century BC). For Lykosoura, see P. Cavvadias (1893) *Fouilles de Lycosoura*, Athens (esp. 16); M. Jost (1985) *Sanctuaires et Cultes d'Arcadie*, Paris: 172–78, 326–37.
- 87 For a list of the Asklepieia of the Greek mainland and the islands, see A. Semeria (1986) *ASNP* 16: 931–58.
- 88 For Kos, note esp. Krug 159–62; S.M. Sherwin-White (1978) *Ancient Cos*, Göttingen: 275–78, 256–57. Herod. *Mimes* 4 need not necessarily be set in the Koan Asklepieion; cf. I.C. Cunningham (1966) *CQ* 16: 115–17. The importance of the Asklepieia, a festival inaugurated in 242, is attested by the decrees of various states agreeing to participate.
- 89 Philostr. *Apoll.* 4.34; for Pergamon, see Kern (1938) 3.157–59; Krug 164–172. Pergamon's chief significance as a healing sanctuary seems to have arisen in the imperial period; C. Habicht *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, pp. 10–11, and (1985) *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*, Berkeley: 44.
- 90 Philostr. *Apoll.* 4.34; *I. Cret.* 1, 17, no. 9.

# NOTES

- 91 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iama 23; cf. Krug 145; C. Benedum (1986) *JDAI* 101: 141; Habicht (1985): 31–32.
- 92 For the Amphiaraion, see J. Travlos (1988) *Bildlexicon zur Topographie des antiken Attika*, Tübingen: 301–18.
- 93 See the opening lines of the *Iliad* (1.9–10, 48–53), where Apollo slays men with the plague.
- 94 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121; cf. *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 128.2; cf. Kerényi (1960) 24–31. At Erythrai, provisions were made for including Apollo in the thanksgiving to Asklepios: H. von Engelmann & R. Merkelbach (1973) *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*, vol. 2, Bonn: 205.30–38.
- 95 The iamata are recorded on stelai: *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–24; Paus. 2.27.3, 2.36.1; see Dillon (1994) 240 n. 3 for other editions. For the cures at Lebea, see Edelstein 1. 239–40; Guarducci 4.154–58; cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1171–72.
- 96 Kern (1938) 3.155; Siefert 333, 335; Dillon (1994) 257–60.
- 97 Strabo 8.6.15; a pinax is mentioned in *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 1; R.A. Tomlinson (1983) *Epidauros*, London: 31–33; Oropos: *LSCG* 69.39–43, *LSCG Suppl.* 35.7–9.
- 98 Van Straten 149–150; cf. Ferguson 101.
- 99 Thessaly: Strabo 9.5.17, 14.1.39, cf. 8.4.4; Hygin. *Fabul.* 14.21; Eus. *Praep. Ev.* 3.14.6; Hom. *Hymn Ask.* 1–3; Apoll. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.616–17; cf. *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 128.27–31; Theod. *Graec. Affect. Cur.* 8.19; Messenia: Hes. F87 (Merkelbach & West); Delphic oracle: Paus. 2.26.7; cf. Krug 129–30; hero: Pind. *P.* 3.5–60; mortal sons: Hom. *Il.* 4.194, cf. 193–202; Paus. 2.26.10; note Arist. F20 (Rose) & Theod. *Graec. Affect. Cur.* 8.23; Isyllos: *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 128.40–50 (see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1886) *Isyllos von Epidauros*, Berlin). Modern accounts of the myths: F. Robert (1935) *Épidaure*, Paris: 9–14; Krug 121–22; Edelstein 2.1–76; Siefert 338–39.
- 100 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22. The theorodokoi lists show widespread participation in the Epidauria festival (esp. *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 94–95).
- 101 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iama 23. Them. *Or.* 27 comments that in his time Asklepios was no longer available locally (presumably due to the onslaught of Christianity), so that travel to Trikke and Epidauros was necessary.
- 102 As indicated by *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 23.
- 103 Cf. Krug 121. Aleshire 4 is incorrect in describing the Athenian Asklepieion as unique because it had only a local status; the majority of Asklepieia in the Greek world had only local significance.
- 104 L. Cohn-Haft (1956) *The Public Physicians of Ancient Greece*, Northampton: 13.
- 105 Cohn-Haft 27–31; S.M. Sherwin-White (1978) *Ancient Cos*, Göttingen: 275–78; cf. Edelstein 2.148 n. 11.
- 106 For incubation, see (including some dated but still useful works): A. Walton (1894) *The Cult of Asklepios*, New York; Deubner (1900); R. Caton (1900) *The Temples and Ritual of Asklepios*, Liverpool; M. Hamilton (1906) *Incubation*, London; C.A. Meier (1967) *Ancient Incubation and Modern Psychotherapy. Studies in Jungian Thought*, tr. M. Curtis, Illinois; Siefert; Dillon (1994).

# NOTES

- 107 Ar. *Wealth* 667–711; cf. Siefert 335–36; temple servants: cf. *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 5.
- 108 Athens *NM* 3369: ‘Archinos dedicated to Amphiaraos’; Herzog 55, 88–91; N. Himmelmann-Wildschütz (1957) *ΘΕΟΛΗΠΙΟΣ*, Marburg-Lahn: 19; U. Hausmann (1958) *Kunst und Heilum*, Potsdam: 55–56; G. Neumann (1979) *Probleme des Griechischen Weibreliefs*, Tübingen: 51, 67, Taf. 28; Siefert 330–32; Krug 136. See also Piraeus Museum no. 405; Hausmann pl. K13; Krug pl. 7; R. Garland (1987) *The Piraeus*, London: pl. 20; van Straten 98. For dreams at Oropos, see Paus. 1.34.5.
- 109 *I. Cret.* 1, 17, no. 9.1–5, 9–11, 17–19; note also no. 24, a votive offering for a cure; for the Asklepieion at Crete, note R.F. Willetts (1962) *Cretan Cults and Festivals*, London: 224–27.
- 110 Paus. 1.34.5; cf. Strabo 14.1.44 on the healing cult at Acharaka near Nysa which relied on dreams.
- 111 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 123 iama 48.
- 112 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 4. Note the example of the unbelieving, ‘Apistos’, in *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 3, see also 36; cf. Krug 136.
- 113 Philostr. *Apoll.* 4.11; *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iamata 25, 33; see O. Weinreich (1909) *Antike Heilungswunder*, Giessen: 103–05; cf. C. Benedum (1986) *JDAI* 101: 143.
- 114 Dreams: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22 iamata 2, 3, 4, 8, 29, 35, 37.
- 115 Arrival: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22 iamata 16, 17, 20, 26; proxy: 21.
- 116 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22 iamata 14, 17, 25 (Asklepios described as a ‘good-looking man’), 31; dogs: 20, 26; goose: 43; dice: 8.
- 117 Serpents: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22 iamata 17, 33, 39, 42. E.P. Lecos & G.E. Pentagalos (1989) in P. Castrén (ed.) *Ancient and Popular Healing*, Vammala: 13, identify the serpents as belonging to the genus *Elaphe longissima*.
- 118 Paus. 2.27.2, and the statues of Asklepios in Kerényi (1960), pls. 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 20, 31, 35–44, 49–52.
- 119 Halieis: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 122, iama 33; cf. Siefert 333; Sikyon: Paus. 2.10.3; Athens: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4960a; EM s.v. *Dexion*; Paus. 2.26.8; Edelstein & Edelstein 2.66, 120, 246; R. Garland (1992) *Introducing New Gods*, London: 116–35 (exaggerating Athens’ contribution to the spread of Asklepios’ cult throughout Greece); Aleshire 7–11.
- 120 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–122, iamata 17, 33, 39, 42.
- 121 Macrobian. *Saturn.* 1.20.1–4; Edelstein 2.167; Siefert 330.
- 122 Ar. *Amphiaraos* F28 (*PCG* 3.2, 47).
- 123 Tholos: Paus. 2.27.3, cf. 5; Kerényi (1960) 44; R.A. Tomlinson (1976) *Greek Sanctuaries*, London: 100, (1983) *Epidauros*, London: 60–61; interpretations: Kerényi 44–46, 102–105; G. Roux (1961) *L’architecture de l’Argolide*, Paris: 187–200; Siefert 340–42.
- 124 Paus. 2.27.1, 6, who notes that this was also the case on Delos.
- 125 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 1.
- 126 See the discussion of the iamata and modern scholarship at Dillon (1994) 239–60, esp. 256–60.
- 127 *LSCG* 69.2–4; cf. Petropoulou 51.
- 128 Cf. Herzog 67.

# NOTES

- 129 Dillon (1994) 258–59; the church of Aghioi Anargyroi (the doctor saints) was built on the site of the Asklepieion below the Athenian acropolis (Travlos 128); a church of the healing saints Kosmas and Damian was built on the Asklepieion at the Piraeus (for Kosmas and Damian, see Deubner (1900) 68–79).
- 130 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iama 25.
- 131 Hdt. 1.46.2–48.1; H.W. Parke (1984) *GRBS* 25: 209–32. Whether it was Amphiaraos’ oracle at Thebes or at Oropos that was consulted by Croesus, and later by Mys (Hdt. 8.133–134.2; Plut. *Mor.* 412a–b, *Arist.* 19.1–2), is debated (see Schachter 1.22), but S. Symeonoglou (1985) in *La Béotie Antique* (no ed.), Paris: 155–58, and T.K. Hubbard (1993) *MH* 50: 196–97 n. 16, argue that this oracle was at Thebes, as is indicated by Hdt. 1.52, 8.134; Plut. *Mor.* 412a–b; Paus. 9.8.3.
- 132 Cf. Morgan (1989) 24, (1990) 16.
- 133 Strabo 9.3.6.
- 134 Eur. *Ion* 226–29, cf. 230–33.
- 135 Plut. *Mor.* 394e–400f; cf. Paus. 10.28.7.
- 136 Diod. 16.26.1–5; see also Paus. 10.5.7, cf. 12; Plut. *Mor.* 433c, 435d; schol. Eur. *Orest.* 165; Them. *Or.* 4.53a; cf. Aeschyl. *Eum.* 1–19.
- 137 Cf. Parke & Wormell 1.24; note the previous version: Parke (1939) *A History of the Delphic Oracle*, Oxford.
- 138 A.P. Oppé (1904) *JHS* 24: 214–40; L.B. Holland (1933) *AJA* 37: 201–14; J. Bousquet (1940–41) *BCH* 64–65: 228; Fontenrose 197–203; Parke & Wormell 1.21–22.
- 139 Cf. Parke & Wormell 1.23–24; Fontenrose 197–200; see also the useful discussion of E. Will (1942) *BCH* 66: 161–75; cf. Amandry 216–25; Dodds 73.
- 140 Lucan: *Civil War* 5.165–74, 190–93; Amandry 21, 237–38; Fontenrose 209–10; Philostratos: *Apoll.* 6.10.
- 141 Aeschyl. *Eum.* 34–64. Eur. *Ion* 91–93 and Plato *Phaedr.* 244a–b, 265a–b are both usually mistranslated to give a Pythia with ‘wild cries’ and madness: see Fontenrose 206.
- 142 Plut. *Mor.* 438a–c; cf. 435c; contra Dodds 72–73; cf. Fontenrose 208.
- 143 Three priestesses: Plut. *Mor.* 414b; contra Lloyd-Jones 66; one priestess originally: see Diod. 16.26.4; Strabo 9.3.5; Paus. 10.5.7; virgin dress: Diod. 16.26.6; Aeschyl. *Eum.* 38; Eur. *Ion* 91, 1324; Ael. *Nat. An.* 11.10; Parke & Wormell 1.35; K. Latte (1940) *HTHR* 33: 17; own dwelling: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 823a (*FD* 3.5.5); a married Pythia: P. de la Coste-Messelière (1925) *BCH* 49: 83, no. 10; chastity: Plut. *Mor.* 435d, 438c.
- 144 Hdt. 7.111.2.
- 145 Schol. Eur. *Phoen* 224; Eus. *Praep. Ev.* 5.28.9; cf. Iamb. *Myst.* 3.11; Luc. *Hes.* 8; Claud. *Carm. Min.* 3.
- 146 Paus. 10.24.7; Plut. *Mor.* 402c–d; Luc. *Bis Acc.* 1 and *Herm.* 60; cf. Greg. Naz. *In Jul. Imp.* 2.32; cf. R. Flacelière (1965) *Greek Oracles*, London: 42–43.
- 147 Fifth century: Soph. F897 (Pearson); Theophr. *Char.* 16.2; Lykoph. *Alex.* 6; Tib. 2.5.63–64; Ovid *Pont.* 2.5.67; Juv. 7.19; see Amandry 129; Parke & Wormell 1.26; laurel: *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 393–96; Callim. *Hymn Del.* 94; Paus. 10.5.5, 9; Ar. *Wealth* 213, with schol.; the ancient

# NOTES

- laurel was probably *prunus laurocerasus*; non-classical sources: Luc. *Bis Acc.* 1, *Hes.* 8; Lykoph. *Alex.* 6; cf. Eus. *Praep. Ev.* 5.28.9.
- 148 Plut. *Mor.* 385c, 397a; the fire in the temple: Paus. 10.24.4; Plut. *Mor.* 385c, *Arist.* 20.4, *Num.* 9.11–12, 15.
- 149 Heliod. *Aeth.* 2.26.
- 150 Ael. *Var. Hist.* 3.44, F80; Gal. *Protr.* 9.23; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 560d–e (Parke & Wormell R4; Fontenrose Q58); cf. Parke & Wormell (1949) CQ 43: 138).
- 151 Plut. *Mor.* 435c; sacrifices within a temple: P.E. Corbett (1970) *BICS* 17: 150, 152.
- 152 Eur. *Ion* 91; for references to the tripod, see Amandry 140–48; Parke & Wormell 1.24–26; Fontenrose 225; Burkert (1983) 116–27.
- 153 Hdt. 8.36.2, 8.37.1; Plut. *Mor.* 292d, 438b; Ael. *Nat. An.* 10.26; Eur. *Ion* 369, 413; see Fontenrose 218–19.
- 154 As in the Vulci kylix and the Praenestine cista; see also Eur. *Andr.* 1104; Fontenrose 217.
- 155 Lloyd-Jones 67; cf. Parke & Wormell 1.33.
- 156 Plut. *Mor.* 396c–397d, 403e, 405c–e; poor quality of some Delphic verse oracles: O.J. Todd (1939) CQ 33: 163–65.
- 157 Plut. *Mor.* 407b; cf. Strabo 9.3.5; Lloyd-Jones 67.
- 158 Parke & Wormell 1.35; R. Flacelière (1965) *Greek Oracles*, London: 52; Parker (1985) 300–01.
- 159 Eur. *Ion* 1323; Plut. *Mor.* 405c.
- 160 Kleomenes: Hdt. 6.66, cf. 5.74.1–75.3, 6.48.1–51; E. David (1984) *RIDA* 32: 136–37; H.W. Parke (1945) CQ 39: 108–09; Parke & Wormell 1.161–62; S. Hodkinson (1983) *Chiron* 13: 273–74; Alkmeonidai: Hdt. 5.63.1, 5.66.1, 5.90.1; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 19.4; Parke & Wormell 1.145–47; Dillon & Garland 115–17; Pleistoanax: Thuc. 5.16–19, cf. 1.114.2; see M. Philippides (1985) *AncW* 11: 33–41. Cf. *HCT* 3.663; Parker (1983) 152–54; Hodkinson (1983) 274–75; Parke (1945) CQ 39: 109–10.
- 161 Lysander: Ephoros *FGH* 70 F206.
- 162 Hermippos *FHG* F48; Parke & Wormell 1.407, R419; Fontenrose Q223.
- 163 See the references at Amandry 27–29, 133; Fontenrose (1959) 426–33, (1978) 219 n. 33.
- 164 Suda s.v. *Pytho*.
- 165 Skiathos–Delphic agreement: P. Amandry (1939) *BCH* 63: 184, ll. 14–16 with Amandry's comments, 195–200, (1944–45) *BCH* 68–69: 411–16, (1950) 32–36; Parke & Wormell 1.18–19; sacrificial cakes: F. Sokolowski (1949) *RA*: 981–84; Fontenrose 223; see in general, F.E. Robbins (1916) *CPh* 11: 278–92.
- 166 Plut. *Mor.* 492a–b.
- 167 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 204; Parke & Wormell R262; R. Stewart (1985) *GRBS* 26: 67–68.
- 168 Eur. *Ion* 258, 334–35, 413–16, *Andr.* 1104–05.
- 169 C.R. Whittaker (1965) *HThR* 58: 27, cf. 24–25; E.E. Evans-Pritchard (1976) *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic amongst the Azande*, Oxford: 135–37; Fontenrose 229; Parker (1985) 301; W.G. Arnott (1989)

# NOTES

- G&R 36: 152–57; Morgan (1990) 176–77; see esp. G.K. Park (1963) *JDAI* 93: 195–209.
- 170 Eur. *Ion* 303 (crops: literally ‘concerning the earth’); cf. *FD* 3.1.560 (Parke & Wormell R334, cf. 111).
- 171 Plut. *Mor.* 386c, 407d, 408c; Morgan (1989) 36.
- 172 Plut. *Mor.* 408c.
- 173 T.E. Gregory (1983) *GRBS* 24: 356, cf. 361–66; E.A. Thompson (1946) *CQ* 40: 35–36; A. Markopoulos (1985) *GRBS* 26: 209; S. Levin (1989) *ANRW* 2, 18.2: 1604–05, 1617–18. Cf. Parke & Wormell 1.408, R436; Fontenrose 208–09, R249 (Val. Max. 1.8.10; Luc. *Civil War* 5.112–97; Oros. *Hist.* 6.15.11).
- 174 Delphi’s role: I. Malkin (1987) *Religion and Colonisation in Ancient Greece*, Leiden: 17–29; Morgan (1990) 172–78; Dillon & Garland 3.
- 175 A.S. Pease (1917) *CPh* 12: 1–20, esp. 18–20; W.G. Forrest (1957) *Historia* 6: 171–73.
- 176 Dorieus: Hdt. 5.42.2–45.1; Herakleia: Thuc. 3.92–93; Dillon & Garland 13–16.
- 177 Thourioi: Diod. 12.35.1–3 (Parke & Wormell R132); cf. Plut. *Per.* 11.5; Dillon & Garland 237; Zankle: Parke & Wormell R384; Fontenrose Q42.
- 178 Eleusis: *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 78.5, 26, 34 (c. 422 BC; *LSCG* 5), cf. *LSCG Suppl.* 13; Cyrene: *LSCG Suppl.* 115a.1–3; Kleisthenes: Hdt. 5.67; Delos: Thuc. 5.1, 5.32.1; sacred land: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 204; see also Parke & Wormell R276–86, 535–73 on religious cults.
- 179 Parke & Wormell R10, 13, 28, 50 (rebuild a temple), 211, 331, 332, 389.
- 180 Sparta: Tyrtaeus F4; Plut. *Lyk.* 6; Athens: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 21.6; Parke & Wormell R21, 80, 216.
- 181 432: Thuc. 1.118.3; Agesipolis: Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.2.
- 182 Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.5–7; cf. Parke & Wormell 1.404, R172; Fontenrose H11.
- 183 Hdt. 1.53.3, 86.1, 91.4 (Parke & Wormell R51–56); Parker (1985) 301–302.
- 184 Lloyd-Jones 69; Parke & Wormell 1.171–74; Dodds 74–75; Burkert (1985) 116; cf. Ferguson 77.
- 185 Hdt. 7.148.3, 7.169.2.
- 186 Hdt. 7.140.1–142.1; Parke & Wormell R94–95; Fontenrose Q146–47.
- 187 Artemision: Hdt. 7.178; cf. Plut. *Arist.* 11.3–9.
- 188 Thanksgivings: Hdt. 8.27.4–5, 9.81.1; *ML* 27 (serpent-column; tr. Dillon & Garland 211); Thuc. 1.132.2–3; Aesch. 3.115; Plut. *Arist.* 20.4; Parke & Wormell R104; Fontenrose 320, Q156; fire extinguished: Plut. *Arist.* 20.4.
- 189 *Didyma II: Inschriften*, Berlin: no. 11; *Milet* 1.3.132a (*LSAM* 42a), 1.3.178; Hdt. 1.46.2–48.1, 1.158.1–159.4.
- 190 Hdt. 1.46.2, 1.158.1, 159.1; on the geographic separation of the patron city, Miletos, and oracular centre, Didyma, see Morgan (1989) 24.
- 191 Destruction: Hdt. 6.18–20 (Miletos had played a leading role in the Ionian Revolt); Ionians and Aeolians: 1.157.3; the Aeolian cities are listed at 1.149.1.

# NOTES

- 192 *LSAM* 50 (*Milet* 1.3.133), 100 BC, a copy of a decree inscribed in 450/49, which also contains an addendum, ll. 40–45, which can be dated to 479/8, indicating that the original decree preceded this date; H.W. Parke (1985) *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*, London: 34; Fontenrose (1988) 14; cf. N. Robertson (1987) *Phoenix* 41: 359–78.
- 193 Kallisthenes *FGH* 124 F14. The story of the medising Branchidai is correctly rejected by Fontenrose (1988) 12–13; and Morgan (1989) 32.
- 194 *Didyma II: Inschriften* 202–306.
- 195 Fontenrose (1988) 55–56, 192 R17 (first century AD); Iamb. *Myst.* 3.11; Porph. *Ep. ad Aneb.* 14; Origen *Contra Celsum* 1.70, 384; Parke (1985) 42.
- 196 Iamb. *Myst.* 3.11.
- 197 *Didyma II: Inschriften* 31.6, 32.8; Fontenrose (1988) 43, and see his catalogue, 179–243.
- 198 *Didyma II: Inschriften* 479.40–43.
- 199 Fontenrose (1988) 104–05; Morgan (1989) 30.
- 200 Fontenrose (1988) R19, 193–94.
- 201 Strabo 14.1.27; Tac. *Ann.* 2.54 (Germanicus' consultation in AD 18); Iamb. *Myst.* 3.11; Dio Chrys. 47.5; Aristeid. 15.5; Parke (1967a) 137–40, and (1985) *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*, London: 112–70.
- 202 Xen. *Ways and Means* 6.2. For Dodona, see C. Carapanos (1878) *Dodone et ses Ruines*, Paris; Parke & Wormell, see index; Parke (1967a) 16–18, 20–25, 109–111, 115, (1967b) 1–163, 259–79; F.T. van Straten (1982) *Lampas* 15: 206–15; Morgan (1990) 149–50, 160; A. Gartzziou-Tatti (1990) *Kernos* 3: 175–84.
- 203 Eur. *Ion* 300.
- 204 Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.3.
- 205 Ephoros *FGH* 70 F206; Diod. 14.13.5–8; Nepos *Lys.* 3.2–4; I. Malkin (1990) *CQ* 40: 541–45; cf. for Siwah, A.M. Woodward (1962) *ABSA* 57: 5–13.
- 206 The numbers here and below refer to Parke (1967b) 263–73, nos 1–29; translations of the public inquiries are nos 1–8, 259–62.
- 207 Parke (1967b) 260–1 nos 2–3, 7; cf. Versnel 5.
- 208 Kallisthenes *FGH* 124 F22.
- 209 Other known Athenian consultations: Xen. *Ways and Means* 6.2–3; Dem. 19.297–99, 21.51–53; Hyper. 4.24–25.
- 210 Ar. *Birds* 716–24; Plato *Laws* 738c.
- 211 Several of the Dodona lead tablets are translated by Parke (1967b) 259–73 (with Greek text). Editions of the lead tablets: Carapanos (1878) 68–83; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1160–66; cf. Versnel 5–6; see also *SEG* 15, 385–409; 19, 426–32; 23, 474–76; 24, 454; 28, 530; 32, 615; *REG* (1939) *BE* no. 153, (1959) no. 231, (1961) no. 371.
- 212 Hom. *Il.* 16.233–35, *Od.* 14.327–28, 19.296–97; Hes. F134.
- 213 Hdt. 2.52–57, three priestesses: 2.55.3; Strabo 7.7.12, cf. 11.
- 214 Parke (1967b) 108–09 (on Kallisthenes *FGH* 124 F22).
- 215 Olympia: Hdt. 8.134.1; Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.2; Parke (1967b) 164–93; Apollo Ismenios: Hdt. 1.92, 5.59–61.1, 8.134.1; cf. Pind. *P.* 11.3–6, F55; Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 21; Philochoros *FGH* 328 F193; Paus. 9.10.4;

## NOTES

Max. Tyr. 41.1; A. Schachter (1967) *BICS* 14: 3–5; Abai: Hdt. 1.46.2, 8.27.4, 8.33, 8.134; Paus. 4.32.5; Ptoios: Hdt. 8.135; Plut. *Mor.* 412a; Paus. 4.32.5, 9.23.6; P. Guillon (1946) *BCH* 70: 216–32; Schachter: 1–2; Kallisthenes *FGH* 124 F11.

## 4 CONTESTS AT PANHELLENIC FESTIVALS

- 1 Olympiads: A.E. Samuel (1972) *Greek and Roman Chronology*, Munich: 189–90; date: Hdt. 7.206, 8.26; Samuel 194; Miller (1975) 215–31 (the second full moon after the summer solstice).
- 2 Thuc. 5.47.10–11.
- 3 R. Knab (1934) *Die Periodoniken*, Giessen, lists the known examples of periodonikai for the history of the panhellenic contests; cf. T. Klee (1918) *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen*, Leipzig: 71–108 for a list of victors at the Olympic, Pythian, Isthmian and Nemean contests; for Milon, see Knab 16–18; Ebert 61; Harris 208–09 n. 1; Kallias: Paus. 5.9.3, 6.6.1; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 826, 893, 1473; *IvO* V 146; *DAA* 164 (cf. 21); *IAG* 15; *Olym.* 228; Kyle 202–03 A29.
- 4 Oligaithidai: Pind. *O.* 13; see W.S. Barrett (1978) in R.D. Dawe *et al.* (eds) *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies*, Cambridge: 1–20; Diagoras: see Harris 209–10 n. 10; Timodemidai: Pind. *N.* 2.19–23; Bassidai: Pind. *N.* 6.31, 58.
- 5 As in *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 893. The Isthmia and Nemea are sometimes inverted: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 880 (cf. 1022).
- 6 Philostr. *Apoll.* 6.10; Suet. *Nero* 23.1.
- 7 For nudity in Greek athletics, see Paus. 1.44.1; Thuc. 1.6.5–6; E.H. Sturtevant (1912) *AJPh* 33: 324–29; J.C. Mann (1974) *CR* 24: 177–78; J.A. Arieti (1975) *CW* 68: 431–36; N.B. Crowther (1982) *Eranos* 80: 163–68; Sweet 124–33; M. McDonell (1991) *JHS* 111: 182–93; cf. for Italy, N.B. Crowther (1980–81) *CJ* 76: 119–23; J.-P. Thuillier (1975) *MEFR* 87: 563–81.
- 8 For a discussion of combat sports, see M.B. Poliakoff (1987) *Combat Sports in the Ancient World*, New Haven: 7–116.
- 9 Panathenaia: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311, c. 400–350; pelike: *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1044.9; for musical contests at festivals, see esp. H.A. Shapiro in Neils 53–75.
- 10 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311 lists contests with the prizes for each, not only for the victor but for other place-winners as well; cf. A.W. Johnston (1987) *ABSA* 82: 125–29.
- 11 Schol. Pind. *N.* 3.147 (Drachmann III.62).
- 12 Paus. 6.11.2–9, cf. 6.6.5–6; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 36 (Ebert 37; *IAG* 21).
- 13 Pind. *O.* 10.16–19.
- 14 Achaean cities: *N.* 10.47; Arcadia: *O.* 7.83; Argos: *O.* 7.83, 13.107, *N.* 10.22–23; Eleusis: *O.* 9.99, 13.110, *I.* 1.57; Epidauros: *N.* 3.84, 5.52, *I.* 8.75; Euboia: *O.* 13.112, *I.* 1.57; Kleitor: *N.* 10.47; Lykaion: *O.* 9.96, 13.108, *N.* 10.48; Marathon: *O.* 9.89, 13.110, *P.* 8.79; Megara: *O.* 13.109, *N.* 3.84, *P.* 8.78, *I.* 8.74; Orchomenos (Boeotia): *I.* 1.56; Pellana: *O.* 9.98, 13.109, *N.* 10.44; Phylake (Thessaly): *I.* 1.59 (cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.695); Sikyon: *O.* 13.109, *N.* 9.53, 10.43, *I.* 4.28; Tegea:



# NOTES

- N. 10.47; Thebes (non-Theban contestants): O. 7.84, 13.107, N. 4.19; tomb of Iolaos: O. 9.98–99, I. 5.32–33; Paus. 9.23.1; Sicily: O. 13.111–12.
- 15 Amphiaraiia: IG VII 414, IG II 5, 978b; Hekatomboia: SIG<sup>3</sup> 36, SIG<sup>3</sup> 82; Eleutheria: Plut. *Arist.* 21.
- 16 Pind. I. 1.
- 17 H.W. Pleket (1975) *Stadion* 1: 61–62.
- 18 *IvO* V 56.
- 19 Speakers: Isoc. *Ep.* 1.6; Iamb. *Pyth.* 12.58; Dio Chrys. 8.9, 27.6; Gorgias: Philostr. *Lives of the Sophists* 9 (209); Arist. *Rhet.* 1414b; statue: Paus. 6.17.7; *IvO* V 293 (CEG II.830); Lysias: Diod. 14.109.1–3; Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 29–30; cf. Themistokles' tirade against Hiero at Olympia: Plut. *Them.* 25.1; Herodotos: Luc. *Hdt.* 1–3, 7; Suda s.v. *Herodotos*; philosophers: Philo *Quod omn.* 96; Hippias: Plato *Hippias* I & II; for 'intellectual activity' at festivals, see M. Kokolakis in Coulson 153–58.
- 20 Plut. *Them.* 17.4.
- 21 Paus. 5.7.10, 5.4.5; Parke & Wormell R490–91; Fontenrose Q7.
- 22 *Hom. Hymn Apoll.* 146–50; Thuc. 3.104.4.
- 23 Paus. 5.10.1.
- 24 Finley & Pleket 14–20 stress the religious character of the Olympic festival and its religious framework.
- 25 Ash-altar: Paus. 5.13.8, 5.15.9; Nemea: Miller (1990) 153; Zeus' altars: A. Mallwitz in Raschke 91–92; flies: Ael. *Nat. An.* 5.17, cf. Paus. 5.14.1 (the Eleians sacrifice to Zeus Apomyios, Zeus 'Averter of Flies').
- 26 Altar at Isthmia: O. Broneer (1971) *Isthmia I: Temple of Poseidon*, Princeton: 98–101; at Nemea: Broneer 98 n. 44; Miller (1990) 149–54.
- 27 Paus. 6.20.8–9.
- 28 Kleosthenes: Paus. 6.10.7; bribery: 5.21.2–17; see below, pp. 222–4.
- 29 Paus. 6.3.8, 7.17.6–7, 13–14; Parke & Wormell R118.
- 30 Anaxandros: Paus. 6.1.7; Diagoras: hypoth. c. Pind. O. 7 (Drachmann I.197); Hyde 130–33; van Straten 83.
- 31 Cf. Morgan (1990) 47–49, (1993) in N. Marinatos & R. Hägg (eds) *Greek Sanctuaries*, London: 20–27.
- 32 Paus. 5.8.6–7.
- 33 W.J. Raschke in Raschke 42.
- 34 I.e. Egypt: W. Decker (1991) 'Olympiasieger aus Ägypten' in U. Verhoeven & E. Graefe (eds), *Religion und Philosophie im alten Ägypten*, Leuven: 93–105; Philostr. *Gymn.* 13, and 24 (Egyptian victor at Plataea, presumably in the Eleutheria); Cyrene: Pind. *P.* 4, 5, 9. IAG collects evidence for individual panhellenic victors; there is a separate volume on the Olympic victors, *Olym.*, with also Moretti (1970) and (1992). See also I. Rutgers' edition (Leiden, 1862) of Africanus' chronological list of Olympian victors. Ebert (1972) collects the epigrams of victors, and Athenian victors in athletic competitions are catalogued by Kyle 195–228. Hyde deals with the victory statues of Olympic victors, including those outside Olympia. Sourcebooks on Greek athletics include R.S. Robinson (1955) *Sources*

# NOTES

- for the *Study of Greek Athletics*, Chicago (repr. 1981); Sweet; Miller (1991); see also the bibliographies of T. Scanlon (1983) *Greek and Roman Athletics: A Bibliography*, Chicago; N.B. Crowther (1984) CW 78: 497–558, (1985) CW 79: 73–135.
- 35 For spectator pilgrims, see L. Drees (1968) *Olympia: Gods, Artists and Athletes*, London: 56–65, esp. 57–58; J.M. Renfrew in Raschke 179–80.
- 36 Epic. 1.6.23–29; Luc. *Hdt.* 8 complains of the heat and lack of space at Olympia.
- 37 Solon: Luc. *Anach.* 16; Thales: Diog. Laert. 1.39.
- 38 Ael. *Var. Hist.* 14.18.
- 39 See H.M. Lee in Coulson 105–11.
- 40 Four boxers: Paus. 5.21.2–4; cf. Finley & Pleket 64; Brophy & Brophy 191 n. 63; Akmatidas: *IAG* 8. For akoniti, note Philostr. *Gymn.* 11; Theogenes: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 36a.3–4 (cf. n. 12 above); Herakleides: Paus. 5.21.12–14.
- 41 Paus. 6.24.3.
- 42 Unpublished fragmentary late sixth-century BC inscription of two fragments discovered at Olympia (tr. but no text at P. Siewert in Coulson 114–15).
- 43 Wrestling: B6075 + B6116; B1291 (late sixth century BC) mentions the wrestler and the judge (diatater) and might also be a law about wrestling.
- 44 Paus. 5.9.4–6; Pind. *O.* 3.12 (476); *IvO* V 2 (*LSAG* 218, 220, pl. 43 n. 15); cf. Hellanikos *FGH* 4 F113. For hellanodikai, see also Philostr. *Apoll.* 6.10; Harp. s.v. *hellanodikai*; note Hdt. 2.160; Philostr. *Gymn.* 18; cf. G. Glotz (1900) *DA* 3.1: 60–64; Drees (1968) 54–55, 94 fig. 21; Finley & Pleket 59–67; N.F. Jones (1987) *Public Organization in Ancient Greece*, Philadelphia: 142–45.
- 45 Egyptians: Hdt. 2.160.1–4; Troilos: Paus. 6.1.4–5; *IvO* V 166 (*IAG* 19; Ebert 38; *M&B* 116).
- 46 Philostr. *Gymn.* 9; Sen. *Ben.* 5.3; Drees (1968) 81; cf. Plut. *Lyk.* 22.8.
- 47 A. Mallwitz in Raschke 79, 94, 103.
- 48 Paus. 10.7.4–5; Cens. 18.6; schol. *Od.* 3.267; hyp. Pind. *P.* c (Drachmann II.4–5); cf. J. Fontenrose in Raschke 125.
- 49 J. Fontenrose in Raschke 125; Pythian festival: see esp. J.H. Krause (1841) *Die Pythien, Nemeen und Isthmien*, Leipzig; A. Mommsen (1878) *Delphika*, Leipzig: 149–214; O. Picard in *M&B* 69–81.
- 50 Paus 10.7.5 (586/5); cf. *Marmor Parium FGH* 239 A37 (in 591/90); cf. Kallisthenes *FGH* 124 T23; Morgan (1990) 136.
- 51 *Marmor Parium FGH* 239 A38; Paus. 10.7.5.
- 52 Amphictyonic role in the contests: Paus. 10.7.4–8; cf. G. Roux (1979) *L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris: 1–19; date: Diod. 15.60; Paus. 10.7.4; Krause 29–36; T. Klee (1918) *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen*, Leipzig: 52–53; date of the first celebration, S.G. Miller (1978) *CLAnt* 11: 127–58.
- 53 Paus. 10.7.2–7, cf. 2.22.8–9; Plut. *Mor.* 638b, 674d–75d, cf. 1133e; Strabo 9.3.10; Picard 72.

# NOTES

- 54 *FD* 3.2.68.1, 71–74; cf. Picard 73.
- 55 Programme: Paus. 10.7.5–8; Plut. *Mor.* 675c–d; Miller (1991) p. 203 lists the competitions and years when they were added to the Pythian and Olympic festivals; Kleisthenes: Paus. 10.7.6; painters: Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 35.35.58; cf. J. Fontenrose in Raschke 139 n. 18.
- 56 Pind. *O.* 13.40 refers to the Isthmian contests as ‘between the seas’. For the Isthmia, see Gardiner (1910) 214–23; Adshead 40–41, 61–64; Richardson (1992) 231–32. The Princeton University excavation volumes are particularly useful for various topographical and architectural topics: *Isthmia*, vols 1–4.
- 57 Paus. 1.44.7–8, 2.1.3; Pind. *F5* (Bowra).
- 58 Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.1–2; Livy 33.32.4.
- 59 Plut. *Thes.* 25.4–6; *Marmor Parium FGH* 239 A20; hyp. Pind. *I.* b, d (Drachmann III.192–95); Thuc. 1.103.4, 1.114.1; cf. E.R. Gebhard in Coulson 74; W.R. Connor (1993) *PAPhS* 137: 201 n. 25.
- 60 Plut. *Kim.* 8.5–7; A. Podlecki (1971) *JHS* 91: 141–43; R. Garland (1992) *Introducing New Gods*, London: 82–98.
- 61 Date: Solinus 7.14 (in the forty-ninth Olympiad); cf. Salmon 195 n. 31; Adshead 40–41; temple: O. Broneer (1973) *Isthmia*, vol. 2, Princeton: 4.
- 62 Livy 33.32.1–2; Polyb. 18.46; cf. Strabo 8.6.20.
- 63 Nikokles: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3779; Paus. 1.37.2; painting: Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 35.85; Aristomache: Plut. *Mor.* 675b.
- 64 Hieronymus *Chronicle* 179. For the Nemean festival, see Gardiner (1910) 66–67, 223–26; Adshead 59–61, 72–76; Miller (1990); Richardson (1992) 232.
- 65 Miller (1990) 27 fig. 7, 29 fig. 8; Paus. 2.15.3 (Opheltes’ heroon); the heroon discovered at Nemea probably belongs to him: Miller 27, 104–110.
- 66 For the myth, see E. Simon *AA* (1979) 31–45.
- 67 Miller (1990) 4–7.
- 68 Telestas: *Olym.* 453; Miller (1990) 36, 188, (1992) 84; Paus. 6.14.4; ‘I win’: *Hesperia* 48 (1979) pl. 40a; Miller (1990) 36, (1992) 85.
- 69 S.G. Miller (1979) *Hesperia* 48: 101, pl. 40c, (1980) *Archaeology* 33.5: 54–56; see also: *AJA* 86 (1982) 586, *AJA* 88 (1984) 69–70, *AJA* 90 (1986) 41; Miller (1989) 95–96, (1990) 37, 187 fig. 66, 188, (1992) 85; for Akrotatos the king: Plut. *Agis* 3.6–7, *Pyrrhus* 26.18, 28.4–5; Paus. 3.6.6; Phylarchos *FGH* 81 F44; Akrotatos the grandfather: Paus. 1.13.5, 3.6.2; Diod. 19.70.
- 70 Kleomenes: Hdt. 6.81; theorodokia: *BCH* 105 (1981) 612–13 (*SEG* 31, 306); contests: Pind. *O.* 7.83; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3145.
- 71 Paus. 8.48.2–3, cf. 5.7.7, 10.7.8; Luc. *Anach.* 9; Plut. *Mor.* 675d–677b; Hdt. 8.26.2.
- 72 Phlegon *FGH* 257 F1 (11)
- 73 Schol. Pind. *O.* 3.60 (Drachmann I.122).
- 74 See below, pp. 200–1.
- 75 Paus. 8.48.2–3; Plut. *Thes.* 21.3, *Mor.* 723–24. Cf. Hyde 160–61; O. Broneer (1962) *AJA* 66: 259–63.
- 76 Hyde 148–55; Kurke 144–45, 145 fig. 30.

# NOTES

- 77 Paus. 6.4.5; the terracotta vase in the shape of a kneeling athlete which has both hands held upright has been considered an example of an athlete binding a fillet on his head (c. 540–530, Agora Museum, Athens, P1231); cf. the well-known ‘diadoumenos’ (Delos, copy of a work by Polykleitos), an athlete (?) binding a fillet on his head (Hyde 150–55, figs 28–29; *M&B* 220).
- 78 Head with fillet from Olympia (*Olym.* 416; *M&B* 231).
- 79 Panathenaic amphora, 363/2 BC; *M&B* 234.
- 80 Lichas: Thuc. 5.50.4; Paus. 6.2.2; Milon: Philostr. *Apoll.* 4.28; Paus. 6.14.7.
- 81 *ARV<sup>2</sup>* 32.3 (Pezzino; *M&B* 199).
- 82 Phyllobolia: Gardiner (1910) 206, with figs 25–26; J.D. Beazley (1956) *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters (ABV)*, Oxford: 260.27; *M&B* 197, 199.
- 83 *ABV* 307.59 (520–500 BC): Gardiner (1910) 243, fig. 37; Hyde 280 fig. 67; *M&B* 198; H.R. Immerwahr (1990) *Attic Script*, Oxford: no. 298, pl. 15, fig. 70.
- 84 Apollonios: Paus. 5.21.14; Arrhichion: Philostr. *Eikon.* 2.6; inscription (third century BC): *Milet* 1238 (Ebert 65).
- 85 Hyde 155–60, with figs 3, 61.
- 86 Pind. *N.* 10.33–36; cf. the epigram for Nikoladas, Simonides 43 (*Anth. Pal.* 13.19; Ebert 26); [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 60.3 (it is argued by many scholars that panathenaic vases were only awarded at the Great Panathenaia). Prizes: see Pleket 67, 70, 84 n. 124, (1975) *Stadion* 1: 54–71; Young (1983) 46–48, (1984) 115–30; Sikyon: Pind. *N.* 10.43, cf. 9.53; Pellana: Pind. *N.* 10.44, cf. *O.* 9.98; Kleitor, Tegea, Achaean cities, Lykaion: Pind. *N.* 10.47–48; cf. Paus. 8.47.4; Marathon: Pind. *O.* 9.89–90; Triopion: Hdt. 1.144.2–3; Thebes: *IG* IV 801 (Friedländer 30; *CEG* I.138); Argos: Pind. *O.* 7.83, *N.* 10.22–23; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3145 (second century AD); I.R. Arnold (1937) *AJA* 41: 436–40; P. Amandry (1983) *BCH* 107: 627–34. On *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3145 the (Athenian) victor’s prizes are carved: from the left, a Panathenaic amphora inscribed ‘Panathenaia’, then a wreath inscribed ‘Isthmia’, a shield ‘from Argos’, and another wreath, ‘Nem[ea]’; photo at *BCH* 107 (1983) 629 fig. 1, and J. Neils in Neils 14 no. 71, with 191; ‘Erga’: Pind. *O.* 7.83–84; a bronze hydria from Phthia (second quarter of the fifth century BC; unknown provenance) reads: ‘from Phthia, the prize for the contests of Protesilaos’ (*BCH* 95 (1971) 617–18, no. 8, fig. 15; *M&B* 33); Ionia: Paus. 5.21.13.
- 87 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 131 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup> 77), tr. in Dillon & Garland 118–19; Plut. *Mor.* 970b; Ael. *Nat. An.* 6.49; Suda. s.v. *prytaneion*. See M. Ostwald (1951) *AJPh* 72: 24–46; W.E. Thompson (1971) *AJPh* 92: 226–37, (1979) *GRBS* 20: 325–29; E.J. Morrissey (1978) *GRBS* 19: 121–25; S.G. Miller (1978) *The Prytaneion*, Berkeley: 7; Kyle 145–47; cf. Hyde 32–37; Gardiner (1930) 99–100.
- 88 Plato *Apol.* 36e; Diog. Laert. 2.42; Cic. *On Oratory* 1.54.232; Kyle 138.
- 89 Keos: *IG* XII.5, 1060; Paros: *IG* XII.5, 274, 281, 289; cf. *I. Magn.* 50.38.

# NOTES

- 90 Plut. *Sol.* 23.3; Diog. Laert. 1.55; Dillon & Garland 79. For Solon and athletics, see D.G. Kyle (1984) *AncW* 9: 91–105, esp. 94–98. See also Vitruv. 9.1 (Olympia, Corinth, Nemea); Dio 52.30.4–6; Pliny *Ep.* 10.118.1, 10.119 (Bithynia).
- 91 Kurke 159 n. 40.
- 92 Xenophanes F2; see the discussion of M. Marcovich (1978) *ICS* 3: 16–26; cf. Isoc. 4.1–2.
- 93 *REG* (1967) *BE* no. 697 (Ebert 10; Moretti (1970) 295–96; *CEG* I.394; 600? BC; Miller (1979) 73).
- 94 [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 60.3.
- 95 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311, c. 370; tr. J. Neils in Neils 16; Miller (1991) 84.
- 96 Taken home: Pind. *N.* 10.33–36.
- 97 For ancient critics of the devotion to athletics and the rewards handed out to victors, see esp. the survey of Kyle 127–54.
- 98 Triumphal entry, without demolition of walls: Vitruv. 9.1 (Olympia, Corinth, Nemea); Diod. 13.82.7; with demolition of walls: Suet. *Nero* 25.1; Dio 63.20; Plut. *Mor.* 639e; see Kurke 133–34.
- 99 Diod. 13.82.7.
- 100 Kurke 131–33, citing Pind. *O.* 4.11, *I.* 1.12; Bacchyl. 10.17.
- 101 Kurke 138–39, citing *Anth. Pal.* 13.15, 16.2; *IvO* V 225 (Ebert 35, 12, 76b.9–10); cf. *Anth. Pal.* 13.14 (Ebert 15).
- 102 Xenophanes F2, 15–22.
- 103 Kyle 155–68 for Athens.
- 104 Thuc. 1.126.3–12; Hdt. 5.71; Dillon & Garland 41–43.
- 105 Hdt. 6.103, cf. 35; Ael. *Var. Hist.* 9.32; Plut. *Marcus Cato* 5.4; *Olym.* 120, 124, 127; Kyle 159, 204 A34; cf. Hyde 363.
- 106 Thuc. 6.16.2; Athen. 3e. Euripides *PMG* 755–56 (Plut. *Alk.* 11, Dem. 1.1) has Alkibiades winning the third rather than the fourth place (note also Isoc. 16.34); for this, see C.M. Bowra (1960) *Historia* 9: 68–79. He also had Nemean and Pythian victories (Plut. *Alk.* 16.7; Athen. 534d; Paus. 1.22.7); see Kyle A4. For Alkibiades and panathenaic amphorai, see D.A. Amyx (1958) *Hesperia* 27: 183–84; J. Neils in Neils 50.
- 107 Plut. *Lyk.* 22.7–8, *Mor.* 639e; but cf. Tyrtaeus F12.1–2, 10–14.
- 108 Kurke 133. For the traditional interpretation of Plutarch, see R. Lonis (1979) *Guerre et religion en Grèce à l'époque classique*, Paris: 27–35; the Teubner text (22.7) emends, giving *victors*.
- 109 Paus. 3.14.3; I. Malkin (1994) *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean*, Cambridge: 82–83, 110, 143, suggests that he was the co-founder.
- 110 Plut. *Mor.* 858a–b; Diog. Laert. 1.74; Polyain. *Strat.* 1.25; Alcaeus 428; Strabo 13.1.38; Suda s.v. *Pittakos*; schol. Aeschyl. *Eum.* 398; *Olym.* 58; L.H. Jeffery (1976) *Archaic Greece*, New York: 89–90; Kyle 20, 110, 156, 213 A68; Kurke 157 n. 19; Dillon & Garland 12–13. For Philippos of Kroton, contra Kurke 136, see Hdt 5.47.
- 111 Hdt. 6.36, 103.2; Dillon & Garland 12, 109.
- 112 *Olym.* 332; Thuc. 3.92–93; Graham 38–39; Cartledge 145; Dillon & Garland 15–16.

## NOTES

- 113 Milon: Diod. 12.9.5–6; Kurke 134–36; Eualkides: Hdt. 5.102.3; Phayllos: Hdt. 8.47.
- 114 Theogenes: Paus. 6.11.2–9; Philippos: Hdt. 5.47; Euthymos: Paus. 6.6.4–11; Callimachus F98 (Pfeiffer); cf. Hyde 35–36; W.J. Raschke in Raschke 39–41.
- 115 Young (1984) 158–59.
- 116 Polymnestor: Africanus, ann. 596; Philostr. *Gymn.* 13; *Olym.* 79; Amesinas: Africanus, ann. 460; Philostr. *Gymn.* 1, 20; *Olym.* 261; Glaukos: Paus. 6.10.1; Philostr. *Gymn.* 20; Simonides *PMG* 4; *Olym.* 134; fish-porter: Simonides 41.
- 117 Athen. 382b; Young (1983) 50, criticising Pleket 60.
- 118 Young (1984) 150–54 with bibliography, cf. 96–98.
- 119 For athletes from a lower socio-economic background and amateurism, see Gardiner (1910) 122–162, (1930) 101–16; Harris 37–38; Pleket; Young (1983) 49–50, (1984) 89–103, 150–62.
- 120 Isoc. 16.33–34.

## 5 PILGRIMAGES BY ETHNIC GROUPS

- 1 *Hom. Hymn Apoll.* 49–89. In general, for restrictions based on ethnicity, see P.E. Corbett (1970) *BICS* 17: 151.
- 2 Thuc. 3.104.1–2, 1.8.1, 5.32.1; Paus. 2.27.1; Hdt. 1.64.2: Peisistratos did so in obedience to an oracle; Diod. 12.58.6–7 (purified in the fifth century due to the plague, and at the command of an oracle); cf. *HCT* 2.414. Thucydides points out, 3.104.2, cf. 1.13.6, that when Polykrates, tyrant of Samos, conquered Rheneia, he dedicated it to the god Apollo, by binding it to Delos with a chain; for the date, see H.W. Parke (1946) *CQ* 40: 105–08. For Thucydides' treatment of this topic: W.R. Connor (1984) *Thucydides*, Princeton: 105–07; B. Jordan (1986) *TAPhA* 116: 122–23, 137–39; S. Hornblower (1992) *HSCPh* 94: 176, 194–96.
- 3 See above, pp. 39–40.
- 4 I. Ringwood-Arnold (1933) *AJA* 37: 452–55; W.A. Laidlaw (1933) *A History of Delos*, Oxford: 46–48; Nilsson (1957) 144–49; Bruneau 76–81. Delos was an oracular centre (*Hom. Hymn Apoll.* 81; cf. Thuc. 3.104.1; Bruneau 142–61; R. den Adel (1982–83) *CW* 76: 288–90; T.E. Gregory (1982–83) *CW* 76: 290–91).
- 5 Thuc. 3.104.6.
- 6 *HCT* 2.415.
- 7 Thuc. 3.104.6 (a hippodromia, which can either be a horse-race or a chariot-race).
- 8 Plut. *Nik.* 3.5–7, *Thes.* 21; Thuc. 3.104.3–6; Luc. *Salt.* 16; Xen. *Comm.* 3.3.12; *Hom. Hymn. Apoll.* 149–50; I. Ringwood-Arnold (1933) *AJA* 37: 452. Socrates' execution was delayed because the Delia was being celebrated: Plat. *Phaed.* 58a–b; Xen. *Comm.* 4.8.2.
- 9 *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1639.13; 1635.68; cf. Paus. 8.48.3; T. Homolle (1890) *BCH* 14: 492; cf. Ringwood-Arnold (1933) 454; Laidlaw 49.

# NOTES

- 10 Thuc. 3.104.4–6, quoting lines 146–50, 165–72 of the hymn at 3.104.4–5.
- 11 Hom. *Od.* 6.162–65; Paus. 8.48.3.
- 12 See above, p. 114.
- 13 Thuc. 3.104.2; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 54.7; see Rhodes 607 on the six-yearly (hepteteric) festival.
- 14 Appointment: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.3; triakonter: Plut. *Thes.* 23.1.
- 15 Plut. *Nik.* 3.5–7; for Delos and Athens in the Peloponnesian War, see Smarczyk 504–25.
- 16 Liturgy: Davies 38; 375/4: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1635.34–35; see bibliography at Davies 38 n. 70 for 371/0.
- 17 Plut. *Nik.* 3.5–6.
- 18 Plut. *Nik.* 3.7–8 (cf. *Mor.* 397f); Callim. *Hymn Del.* 314–15, for which see W.H. Mineur (1984) *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos*, Amsterdam: 244, note on line 314.
- 19 Plut. *Nik.* 3.1–4; for the liturgy of the gymnasia, see Davies 35–37, 40.
- 20 Athen. 172f–173a.
- 21 See Bruneau 81–85.
- 22 Hdt. 4.34; Callim. *Aetia* 186, *Hymn Del.* 278–99; Paus. 1.31.2; Plut. *Mor.* 1136ab; Ael. *Var. Hist.* 3.1; Parke (1967b) 279–86; Bruneau 38–48 (Delian accounts, 39); N. Robertson (1983) *TAPhA* 113: 145 n. 5, 149–53.
- 23 For the Panionia and Panionion, see T. Lenschau (1916) *RE* 9: 1876, (1944) *Klio* 18: 227–36; Caspari 173–88; W. Judeich (1933) *RhM* 82: 305–14; C.F. Lehmann-Haupt (1934) *Klio* 27: 74–77; C.J. Cadoux (1938) *Ancient Smyrna*, Oxford: 67–68; Magie 1.65–66, 2.866–69; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1962) *Kleine Schriften* 5.1, Berlin: 128, 137; G. Kleiner *et al.* (1967) *Panionion und Melie*, Berlin; C. Habicht (1970) *Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte*, Munich: 17; G. Ragone (1986) *RFIC* 114: 173–205; K. Tausend (1992) *Amphiktyonie und Symmachie*, Stuttgart: 55–57, 90–95.
- 24 Caspari 173–76.
- 25 Hdt. 1.143.2–3; Hom. *Il.* 20.403–05; Strabo 8.7.2; cf. Caspari 175–76.
- 26 Hdt. 1.148.1; Strabo 8.7.2, 14.1.20; Diod. 15.49.1; agones: *RC* 52.27–28 (167/6 BC).
- 27 Hdt. 1.141.4, 6.7.
- 28 Hdt. 1.142–43; Ael. *Var. Hist.* 8.5; Strabo 14.1.1–1.4; Vitruv. 4.1.4; *Marmor Parium FGH* 239 A27; cf. Hdt. 1.145–46, 149, 150.1–2; Vell. Pater. 1.4.3; Paus. 5.8.7, 7.2.1–7.5.1; Diod. 15.49.1; Michel 485; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 368; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 303d.
- 29 Literary sources: Hdt. 1.141.4, 142.1, 143.3; Paus. 7.5.1; Diod. 15.49.1; Strabo 8.7.2, specifically as the koinon at 14.1.31; epigraphic source: *RC* 52.34 (167/6 BC). An inscription of 289–88 mentions the ‘koinon of the thirteen cities’: Michel 485.1–2; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 368.1 is a copy of Michel 485, but does not give the number of the cities in the koinon; *RC* 3: the first epigraphic mention of the Panionion (303 BC).
- 30 *RC* 3.3.
- 31 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1962) 141; W.W. Tarn (1953) *CAH* 6.490.
- 32 Hdt. 1.141–46, 148, 6.42.1; Caspari 181.

# NOTES

- 33 *I. Priene* 37.
- 34 Diod. 15.49.1; Thuc. 3.104.3; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1962) 141–42; Caspari 182–83; S. Hornblower (1982) *Historia* 31: 241–45; Parke & Wormell R182.
- 35 Diod. 15.49.1–4.
- 36 Alexander: Magie 2.868; Lenschau (1916) 1890; Welles *RC* pp. 214–15; Antigonos: Tarn *CAH* 6.371, cf. 490; Diadochoi: Sokolowski *LSAM* 38, p. 109.
- 37 *RC* 3.2; *RC* 52.51–68 (167/6). Similarly, in 266 bc, the koinon had honoured Antiochos I with sacrifices (Michel 486).
- 38 C. Habicht (1970) *Gottmenschen und Griechische Städte*, Munich: 17.
- 39 *OGIS* 222.24–31; Strabo 14.1.31; Habicht 17, and 22–25 for the foundation date of the festival.
- 40 Hdt. 1.144.
- 41 The first evidence for it comes from *I. Ilion* 1, 306 bc; for the festival, see E. Preuner (1926) *Hermes* 61: 113–33; Magie 2.869–70; *I. Ilion* (Frisch) xii–xiii; eleven members: Frisch xiii with references; founded by Alexander (Magie 1.65–66), or Antigonos (Frisch xii; Tarn *CAH* 6.490).
- 42 Magie 1.66.
- 43 *I. Ilion* 10 (*LSAM* 10); 77 bc.
- 44 ‘The koinon of the Ilians’: *I. Ilion* 24.16–17; cf. 1.17, 22, 25–26, 36; 32.39–40; *OGIS* 219.39–40; organisation of the festival: *I. Ilion* 1 (306 bc); 3 (honouring Parion, c. 200 bc, with Dittenberger *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 596, p. 123, n. 10); 10.
- 45 *I. Ilion* 10.21.
- 46 *I. Ilion* 10.23–24, 34–43.
- 47 Paus. 9.3.5; Men. Rhet. 1.367. The evidence for the Daidala as discussed below is drawn from Paus. 9.3.3–8; Plut. F157 (Sandbach); for the holocaust, cf. Paus. 7.18.11–13; Dillon (1993) 327–29; see also M.P. Nilsson (1923) *JHS* 43: 144; C. Kerényi (1975) *Zeus and Hera*, London: 141–47; Schachter 245–50; M. Rocchi (1989) *DHA* 15: 315–24.
- 48 Cf. Kerényi (1975) 144, cf. (1960) 93.
- 49 Schachter 248–49 argues that the list of cities in Pausanias does not represent the cities who participated in the Great Daidala in the classical period.
- 50 Paus. 9.3.5; Schachter 250.
- 51 Paus. 7.19.3–9; 9.8.2, 34.5.
- 52 Schachter 246.
- 53 Paus. 9.34.1; *IG* VII.2711, 56–57, 73; cf. A.G. Gossage (1975) *ABSA* 70: 115–34.
- 54 Polyb. 5.8.3–5, 11.7.2; *SEG* 11, 338.7; de Ligt 40–41; cf. de Ligt & de Neeve (1988) 394–95, 398; F.W. Walbank (1957) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 1, Oxford, n. at 5.8.5.
- 55 Strabo 8.6.14; cf. Plut. *Dem.* 29.1.
- 56 *LSCG Suppl.* 45; de Ligt & de Neeve (1988) 405, 412; de Ligt 244–45.
- 57 M. Jost (1994) in S.E. Alcock & R. Osborne (eds) *Placing the Gods*, Oxford: 227–28, cf. 219; *IG* V, 2, 549–50; cf. Paus. 8.38.6–7.



# NOTES

- 58 Paus. 7.16.9–10 (συνέδριά τε κατὰ ἔθνος...κατελέλυτο ὁμοίως πάντα).
- 59 Festival of Hera, Italy: Arist. *On Marvellous Things Heard* 96; Olympia: Timaios *FGH* 566 F45; cf. Pind. *O.* 13.111–12; I. Ringwood-Arnold (1960) *AJA* 64: 249.
- 60 Artemis Amarynthia: Livy 35.38.4; cf. Paus. 1.31.5; I. Ringwood-Arnold (1929) *AJA* 33: 386; Apollo's festival at Tamynai: 389; *IG* XII (9) 91–95a, first century BC; Hesiod *Works and Days* 650–59; Pind. *O.* 13.112, *I.* 1.57; Baccyl. 10 (9).34; festival of Helios: Appian *Roman History* 9.3; I. Ringwood-Arnold (1936) *AJA* 40: 435–36; Tenos: Strabo 10.5.11.
- 61 Eur. *The Cretans* F472 (Nauck); M. Guarducci (1950) *Inscriptiones Creticae* 4: *Tituli Gortynii*, Rome: no. 80; Diod. 5.70; Diog. Laert. 8.3; Plat. *Laws* 625a–b; Theophr. *Enquiry into Plants* 3.3–4; Porph. *Abst.* 4.19, *Pyth.* 17; Stat. *Theb.* 4.105; R.F. Willetts (1955) *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete*, London: 110–11, (1962) *Cretan Cults and Festivals*, London: 219, 238, (1977) *The Civilization of Ancient Crete*, London: 201–03.
- 62 Xen. *Anab.* 5.3.9; see Dillon (1990) 82–83.
- 63 Strabo 14.1.45.
- 64 Alkmeonides: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1469; *LSAG* 73, 78 n. 30; Kyle 196; Dillon & Garland 100; Hipparchos: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1470; Kyle 221.
- 65 For Athens as a religious centre for the allies, and their religious obligations, see R. Meiggs (1972) *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford: 290, 298–305; cf. B.D. Meritt & H.T. Wade-Gery (1962) *JHS* 82: 71; J.P. Barron (1964) *JHS* 84: 47; A.E. Raubitschek (1966) *AJA* 70: 37; D. Kagan (1969) *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*, Cornell: 102; P.J. Rhodes (1985) *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford: 24, 38, 42; I. Malkin (1987) *Religion and Colonisation in Ancient Greece*, Leiden: 122; W.R. Connor (1993) *PAPhS* 137: 194–206; R. Parker (1994) in R. Osborne & S. Hornblower (eds) *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, Oxford: 342.
- 66 For the Panathenaia, see esp. [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 49.3, 60.1; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 334 (organisational details of the Little Panathenaia: tr. in L.B. Zaidman & P.S. Pantel (1992) *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, Cambridge: 110–11); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311; Lysias 21.1–2, 4 (Panathenaic liturgies); Deubner (1932) 29–31; J.A. Davison (1958) *JHS* 78: 23–42; H.A. Thompson (1961) *AA* 76: 223–31; Davies 36–37; Parke (1977) 33–50; Simon 55–72; N. Robertson (1985) *RhM* 128: 231–95, (1992) *Festivals and Legends*, Toronto: 90–119; H.A. Shapiro (1989) *Art and Cult under the Tyrants*, Mainz: 18–47; Neils: *passim*. Established in 566: Marcellinus *Vita Thuc.* 3; Eusebius *ad Ol.* 53.2; while schol. Aristeid. *Panathenaicus* 13.189.4–5 has Peisistratos introducing the Great Panathenaia.
- 67 See J.B. Connelly (1996) *AJA* 100: 53–80.
- 68 Travlos 422–27; H.A. Thompson & R.E. Wycherley (1972) *The Athenian Agora XIV: The Agora of Athens*, Princeton: 192–94; Robertson (1992) 97–98.
- 69 Panathenaic ship: Paus. 1.29.1, a ship for 'the Panathenaic procession', indicating that the ship was used annually; Strattis F31, fourth century

# NOTES

- BC (PCG 7.638); Diod. 22.46.2; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 657; Plut. *Demetr.* 10.5, 12.3, 7; Philostr. *Lives of the Sophists* 2.1.7; Plautus *Mercator* 66–68; Himerios *Orat.* 3.12; schol. Ar. *Knights* 566: Suda s.v. *peplos*; not all scholars, however, agree that the peplos was presented annually; peplos: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 49.3, 60.1; N. Robertson (1985) *RhM* 128: 288–95; E.J.W. Barber in Neils 103–17.
- 70 Fourth-century list of contests: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2311 (c. 400–350), tr. in Miller (1991) 84; Perikles: Plut. *Per.* 13.11; Hipparchos: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 18.1; Homeric recitations: [Plat.] *Hipparch.* 228b; cf. Diog. Laert. 1.57 (ascribing it to Solon); Isoc. 4.159; Lyk. *Leok.* 102; Ael. *Var. Hist.* 8.2; Shapiro (1989) 43–47; for contests at the Panathenaia, note esp. Kyle 178–94. See above, p. 117 for monetary prizes at the Panathenaia.
- 71 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 334.25–27
- 72 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 14.3 (*ML* 40; cf. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 15); tr. in Dillon & Garland 241–42; *ML* 91 notes that this constitutes ‘an early stage of the conversion of an Athenian into an Empire festival’.
- 73 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 71.56–58 (*ML* 69); J.P. Barron (1964) *JHS* 84: 47; Smarczyk 525–49; tr. in Dillon & Garland 259–60: [καθάπερ ἄπο]κ[οι ννν], l. 58; Ar. *Clouds* 386–87 with schol.
- 74 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 46.15–17 (*ML* 49), c. 445–430; tr. in Dillon & Garland 242–43. See B.D. Meritt & H.T. Wade-Gery (1962) *JHS* 82: 69–71 for the argument that the Brea and Parian measures support the restoration; cf. Graham 62–63.
- 75 *SEG* 31, 67, lines 2–6; J. Cargill (1981) *The Second Athenian Confederacy*, Berkeley: 163 with n. 5.
- 76 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 34 (420s, after 425; *ML* 46), ll. 41–43, cf. 34, tr. in Dillon & Garland 261–63; H. Mattingly (1961) *Historia* 10: 153.
- 77 Mattingly (1961) 153; Graham 63.
- 78 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 68 (*ML* 68), tr. Dillon & Garland 258–59; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 34.
- 79 Brea: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 46.16–17.
- 80 P. Krentz (1993) *AHB* 7: 12–16; cf. Burkert (1983) 69–72; S.G. Cole (1993) in R. Scodel (ed.) *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, Michigan: 26–28.
- 81 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 34; 68; Isoc. 8.82; Ar. *Ach.* 501–05, 642, with schol. 504; S. Goldhill (1987) *JHS* 107: 60–62.
- 82 Ar. *Ach.* 502–05.
- 83 Eleusis: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 78 (422? bc); tr. in Dillon & Garland 351–52; see R. Meiggs (1972) *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford: 302–04; Clinton (1974) 14–15; M. Jameson (1983) in P. Garnsey & C.R. Whittaker (eds) *Trade and Famine in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge: 10; Smarczyk 167–98.
- 84 Meiggs (1972) 302.
- 85 Pythia: Isoc. 4.31; cleruchies: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.274–79; Lemnian Athena: Paus. 1.28.2; dedication at Athens by the Athenian cleruchy at Potidaea: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 74 (cf. Thuc. 2.70.4); Parker (1994) 341.
- 86 [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.16–18; Meiggs (1972) 290.
- 87 Priene: *I. Priene* 5; Kolophon: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 456a.7–9, b.3–8 (307 bc); Paros: J.H. Oliver (1936) *AJA* 40: 461–63 (c. 372/1 bc).
- 88 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 47; Graham 163–64.
- 89 See Graham 108 with n. 1, 161.

## NOTES

90 Thuc. 1.25.4; Graham 160–61.

### 6 CULT REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

- 1 J.W. Hewitt (1909) *TAPhA* 40: 83–91.
- 2 For example, *LSCG* 130 (Astypalaia, third century BC).
- 3 Hdt. 6.81 (Argos), 5.72.3 (Athens); see A. Griffiths (1989) in A. Powell (ed.) *Classical Sparta*, London: 58–60; cf. H.R. Immerwahr (1966) *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, Ohio: 192–93; J. Hart (1982) *Herodotus and Greek History*, London: 83, 128–29, 132; J. Alty (1982) *JHS* 102: 13.
- 4 *LSCG* 101.3–7.
- 5 Paros: *LSCG* 110; cf. *LSAG* 296 n. 39, 305, 412, pl. 56; L.H. Jeffery (1976) *Archaic Greece*, New York: 48 n. 4; Mykonos: *LSCG* 96.26 (c. 200 BC); Gymnopaidiai: Plut. *Ages.* 29.3, *Kim.* 10.6; Eleians: Paus. 5.2.1–5; Chaironeia: Plut. *Mor.* 267d; Gephyraioi: Hdt. 5.61.2.
- 6 Burkert (1985) 95; see esp. Hdt. 1.132.3; note *LSCG* 69.25–29.
- 7 *LSCG* 102 (fourth century BC); cf. Sokolowski *LSCG* 102 p. 196.
- 8 *LSAM* 55 (c. 350 BC).
- 9 Plut. *Arist.* 21.4.
- 10 Eleusis: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.207; cf. *LSCG* 110 (the reference to slaves not being permitted is restored); cf. *LSCG Suppl.* 20 (Athens, a decree of the orgeones, third century BC: slaves to receive a share of the sacrifice); Andania: *LSCG* 65.18; Samothrace, the mystai lists: Cole (1984) 43–44.
- 11 Paus. 2.10.2, 2.10.4, 2.35.11, 6.20.3, 6.25.2, 10.32.13; Strabo 14.1.44.
- 12 Dionysos the Deliverer: Paus. 9.16.6; Eurynome: 8.41.5–6; Mother Dindymene: 9.25.3; Artemis: 10.35.7; Hera: 7.23.9; Zeus Lykaios, Megalopolis: 8.30.2; Zeus Lykaios, Mt Lykaios: 8.38.6.
- 13 *LSCG* 69.2–4; cf. Petropoulou 51.
- 14 For details of other Asklepios festivals, see Edelstein & Edelstein 2.195–99.
- 15 Plat. *Ion* 530a; cf. Edelstein & Edelstein 2.195–96 n. 3; Kern (1938) 3.409.
- 16 Plut. *Mor.* 292e–f, 398a. H.W. Parke (1943) *CQ* 37: 19–22 argues that Plutarch means the fifth century by ‘recently’ because of the long (mythical) history of the oracle; cf. Amandry 81–85. Closed for winter: W.R. Halliday (1928) *The Greek Questions of Plutarch*, Oxford: 62; cf. Amandry 81 with n. 4.
- 17 Contra Parke & Wormell 1.17.
- 18 Plut. *Mor.* 414b.
- 19 Plut. *Alex.* 14.6–7 (Parke & Wormell R270; Fontenrose Q216); J.R. Hamilton (1969) *Plutarch: Alexander*, Oxford: 34–35.
- 20 Diod. 16.25.3.
- 21 Plut. *Mor.* 438a–c, cf. 435b–c, 437b; cf. above, p.83.
- 22 Proxenos: see Eur. *Andr.* 1103, cf. *Ion* 335, *Hel.* 146.
- 23 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 548.10.
- 24 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 585 (Rome: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 585.16–17); see *SIG*<sup>3</sup> II, pp. 102–04.

# NOTES

- 25 Aeschyl. *Eum.* 32–33.
- 26 For a detailed discussion, see P.E. Legrand (1900) *REG* 13: 281–301; cf. Amandry 113–14; for promanteia at Didyma, see Fontenrose (1988) 105.
- 27 Dem. 19.327 (and 9.32); cf. Plut. *Per.* 21.3.
- 28 For example, *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 548; another example is the promanteia given to the Thebans: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 176.
- 29 Schol. Ar. *Wealth* 845; cf. Polyain. 5.17.1.
- 30 For discussions of these terms, see R.M. Simms (1990) *GRBS* 31: 183–95; cf. Mylonas 237–39; Kerényi (1967) 45–47; Burkert (1983) 248–49, 265 n. 1, (1987) 7–10; note esp. Plat. *Symp.* 210a.
- 31 Plut. *Demetr.* 26.
- 32 Schol. Plat. *Gorg.* 497c; tr. D.G. Rice & J.E. Stambaugh (1979) *Sources for the Study of Greek Religion*, Chico: 191–92; accepted by Mylonas 243; Burkert (1983) 266 n. 7. Parke (1977) 60 and Clinton (1974) 13 n. 13 doubt the compulsory nature. Clinton 13 n. 13, cf. Simms (1990) 183 n. 1, points out that there is a disparity between the receipts for the Greater and Lesser Mysteries of the order of 4,399%, drachmas as against 45% respectively in 408/7 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 386.144–46). If the amounts for the Lesser Mysteries as recorded in *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 386.144–46 are accepted, then the 15 drachmas to have a slave initiated in the month of Anthesterion, as recorded in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.207, could not refer to the Lesser Mysteries, and would indicate that initiation in the Greater Mysteries cost this sum. However, if myesis cost 15 drachmas for a slave, the amount at *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 386 cannot possibly represent the full amount of the initiation fees for that year.
- 33 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 847.22–24.
- 34 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 6C.26–30, restored by B.D. Meritt (1945) *Hesperia* 14: 70–71, 77, but later questioned by him: (1946) *Hesperia* 15: 251; see also F. Sokolowski (1959) *HTHR* 52: 4; Richardson (1974) 20–21; R.M. Simms (1990) *GRBS* 31: 186–87; for one mystagogos per mystes: Mylonas 237, 249; Parke (1977) 62 with 194 n. 54; Burkert (1985) 287, 460 n. 20 incorrectly citing *LSCG Suppl.* 15.18, 25, 35; see also Andoc. 1.132.
- 35 Cf. Burkert (1985) 267.
- 36 See *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–122 iamata 1, 6, 11, 15, 17, 24, 27, 28, 29, 38; the abaton is referred to as the enkoimeterion at Pergamon (*Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.11, 12, 18, 27, cf. 14). For the abaton, see F. Robert (1935) *Épidaure*, Paris: 29–30; Burford 50–51, 62–63, 82; R.A. Tomlinson (1983) *Epidauros*, London: 67–71.
- 37 *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.2–14.
- 38 H. von Engelmann and R. Merkelbach (1973) *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*, vol. 2, Bonn: 205.30–38.
- 39 *I. Perg.* II, 264 (the context is fragmentary).
- 40 Ar. *Wealth* 656–58 (presumably the Piraeus, due to the proximity of this Asklepion to the sea); Xen. *Comm.* 3.13.3 (Amphiaraios). Ritual bathing is purificatory for obvious reasons; cf. Edelstein & Edelstein 2.149; Parker (1983) 212–13.
- 41 Paus. 9.39.7; they were also to abstain from hot baths (9.39.5).

# NOTES

- 42 Lykoph. *Alex.* 1050; Timaios *FGH* 566 F56.
- 43 *LSCG Suppl.* 35.3–4; *LSCG* 69.20–22, 26–27, 36–43. Paus. 1.34.4–5 explains the use of dreams at the Amphiaraion.
- 44 Paus. 1.34.5; A. Petropoulou (1985) in *La Béotie Antique* (no ed.), Paris: 169–77.
- 45 The restoration of sight is a common subject in the Epidaurian iamata: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22 iamata 4, 9, 11, 18, 20, 22, 32.
- 46 Ar. *Wealth* 660, 676–81.
- 47 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 128.3.29–31.
- 48 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 5.
- 49 *LSCG Suppl.* 22; Sokolowski p. 57 provides analogous examples: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1039; *LSAM* 12.10–17; 22; 23; 24a; *LSCG Suppl.* 7; 19.86–92; 108; for Delos: Bruneau 288.
- 50 Corinth: N. Bookidis (1993) in N. Marinatos & R. Hägg (eds) *Greek Sanctuaries*, London: 45–61; Samothrace: Cole (1984) 36–37; other pilgrimage centres: M.S. Goldstein (1978) *The Setting of the Ritual Meal in Greek Sanctuaries: 600–300 BC*, PhD thesis, Berkeley; Tenos: Strabo 10.5.11; cf. E. Ziebarth (1935) *Gasthäuser im alten Griechenland*, Athens: 341–42; Nilsson (1955) 828, (1957) 188–89; Burkert (1985) 107, 234, 390 n. 80.
- 51 Eur. *Ion* 1122–98; cf. *LSCG* 65.35.
- 52 Oropos: *LSCG* 69.30–33; Epidauros: Paus. 2.27.1.
- 53 For example: Athens: *LSCG* 18 (fourth century BC; the sacrificial calendar of the deme Erchia, with 22 instances of the prohibition); *LSCG* 54.10–11 (first century AD; rural cult of Asklepios and Hygieia); Ar. *Wealth* 1138; Kos: *LSCG* 156b.16 (third century BC; the theoroi setting out for Delos sacrifice to Apollo Dalios and the meat must not be taken away from Kos); Rhodes: *LSCG Suppl.* 88b.4–5; see Goldstein 51–54, 322–55 who gives several examples; cf. W. Burkert (1966) *GRBS* 7: 104 n. 36.
- 54 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 128.2.18–19 (third century BC); contra Edelstein & Edelstein 2.150. See *I. Perg.* II, 264; Aristeid. *Orat.* 48.31; cf. *IG* XII, 9, 194), but this does not relate to incubation.
- 55 *LSCG Suppl.* 22.
- 56 *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.14–15.
- 57 Paus. 9.39.5–14. For the cult of Trophonios, see M. Hamilton (1906) *Incubation*, London: 88–93; R.J. Clark (1968) *TAPhA* 99: 63–75; A. Schachter (1984) *AJPh* 105: 258–70; S. Levin (1989) *ANRW* 2, 18.2: 1637–42; M. Bonnechère (1989) *LEC* 57: 289–302. This was the oracle which Xouthos consulted before Apollo's oracle: Eur. *Ion* 300.
- 58 Paus. 9.39.11.
- 59 *LSCG* 136.25–26; cf. J.W. Hewitt (1909) *TAPhA* 40: 84.
- 60 Melanthios *FGH* 326 F4.
- 61 *LSCG* 65.23, 99–103. As animals were killed in a sacrificial context, most if not all leather would have come from sacrificed animals (but cf. R. Osborne (1993) *CQ* 43: 394–95 n. 11).
- 62 *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.12–13.
- 63 Paus. 2.26.9, 10.32.12; Sext. Emp. *Hypotyposeis* 3.220–21; Serv. *Verg. Georg.* 2.380; Parker (1983) 357–65.

# NOTES

- 64 Edelstein & Edelstein 2.149.
- 65 Kratinos F236 (*PCG* 4.241).
- 66 Philostr. *Apoll.* 2.37; cf. Deubner (1900) 14–17.
- 67 Strabo 14.1.44.
- 68 Melanthios *FGH* 326 F2; Ael. *Nat. An.* 9.51; Arbesmann 76–77; Parker (1983) 358.
- 69 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 206–11; schol. Nik. *Alex.* 130.
- 70 Plut. *Phok.* 6.7; Polyain, *Strat.* 3.11.2 (the day the mystai journeyed to the sea); cf. Plut. *Cam.* 19.6. Themistokles had Iakchos as ally for the battle of Salamis and Chabrias had the mystai: Polyain. 3.11.2.
- 71 Hdt. 8.133–34; Plut. *Mor.* 412a–b; *Aristeid.* 19.1–2.
- 72 Hdt. 8.135; Paus. 9.23.6; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 412a.
- 73 Cf. Petropoulou 51–52.
- 74 Sopat. *Rhet. Gr.* 8.110; cf. Mylonas 272.
- 75 Hdt. 8.144.2.
- 76 Suet. *Nero* 34.4; cf. Mylonas 247–48, K.R. Bradley (1978) *Suetonius' Life of Nero*, Brussels: 206.
- 77 Hdt. 5.22; Brophy & Brophy 174 (the historicity of the incident has been doubted).
- 78 Polyb. 2.13; Gardiner (1910) 218.
- 79 Petropoulou 53–54; fees at Oropos: *LSCG Suppl.* 35.3–6; *LSCG* 69.20–24; cf. F. Sokolowski (1954) *HTHR* 47: 153.
- 80 *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.8. For Epidauros, see *LSCG Suppl.* 22; cf. *LSCG* 60; for fees, see W.H.D. Rouse (1902) *Greek Votive Offerings*, Cambridge: 200; Sokolowski 153.
- 81 Corinth: F.J. de Waele (1933) *AJA* 37: 428; cf. C. Roebuck (1941) *Corinth 14. The Asklepieion and Lerna*, Princeton: 28–30; Oropos: *LSCG* 69.23; Schachter 19–27; G. Kaminski (1991) *JDAI* 106: 63–181.
- 82 Oropos: *LSCG Suppl.* 35.3–6; *LSCG* 69.20–24; Petropoulou 58; Leba-deia: *LSCG* 74. Sokolowski *LSCG* p. 150 lists inscriptions giving the cost of consultations.
- 83 Eur. *Ion* 226–29; H.W. Parke (1939) *Hermathena* 28: 63 n. 7.
- 84 Parke (1939) 59–65, who dates it probably to the last two decades of the fifth century; cf. Parke & Wormell 1.43 n. 62.
- 85 Parke (1939) 61, 64.
- 86 Luc. *Alex.* 19.
- 87 P. Amandry (1939) *BCH* 63: p. 184, lines 6–8, with 185–219, (1944–45) *BCH* 68–69: 411–16.
- 88 Parke & Wormell 1.32.
- 89 Plut. *Mor.* 437b, cf. 435b–c and 438a–b; Eur. *Ion* 228–29.
- 90 *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 532–39.
- 91 Callim. F191.26–27 (Pfeiffer).
- 92 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.207; 1673.62 with K. Clinton (1971) *AE*: 91. Mylonas 237, and Parke (1977) 61, assume that the 15 drachmas would be for the Greater Mysteries; Kerényi (1967) 59 takes the fact that the payment was made in Anthesterion as an indication that the payment was for the Lesser Mysteries; Parke (1977) 60: payment for the Greater Mysteries might have occurred at the day of the agyrrhos.
- 93 Mylonas 238; Parke (1977) 63.

## NOTES

- 94 In Ar. *Peace* 374–75.
- 95 IG I<sup>3</sup> 6C (tr. in Dillon & Garland 350). For the costs of initiation, see Mylonas 237–38; Kerényi (1967) 59–60; Clinton (1974) 10–13, 26, 46, 68; Richardson (1974) 21; Parke (1977) 61.
- 96 Corinth: Roebuck (1941) 114–28, pls 33–46; cf. M. Lang (1977) *Cure and Cult in Ancient Corinth: A Guide to the Asklepieion*, Princeton: 15–27; F.J. de Waele (1933) *AJA* 37: 440–44. Athens: IG II<sup>2</sup> 1532–39; van Straten 108–13; Aleshire 37–51; Oropos: van Straten 101, 125. Generally, see Siefert 328; Ferguson 92–93.
- 97 IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 440 and 474; van Straten 122–23.
- 98 IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 4, 6, 8, 10, 15. Note that IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 1 mentions a pinax. See the discussion of thanksgiving offerings at Epidauros in Dillon (1994) 250–53.
- 99 IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 1; cf. IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 125–27. The god might command that the cure be recorded: IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 126.31–32 (Epidauros); SIG<sup>3</sup> 1172 (Lebena).
- 100 IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iama 22; see Herzog 134, cf. 96.
- 101 IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 6–7; see Herzog 133–34, cf. 124–25.
- 102 IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 123 iama 47; see Dillon (1994) 253 n. 73; other examples of dedications from part of the proceeds from the sale of fish: IG I<sup>3</sup> 828; Paus. 10.9.3–4; cf. Herzog 133, 136; van Straten 92.
- 103 Sostrata: IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 25; Ambrosia: iama 4.
- 104 IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 5.
- 105 *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.29–30.
- 106 Dice: IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 8; stone: iama 15.
- 107 Plat. *Phaedo* 118a; Luc. *Bis Acc.* 5; Olympiod. In Plat. *Phaed. Comm.* 205.24, 244.17; Tert. *Apol.* 46.5; Lact. *Div. Inst.* 3.20.16–17, *Inst. Epit.* 32.4–5; Prud. *Apoth.* 203–06.
- 108 Herod. *Mimes* 4.11–18, 86–87; see I.C. Cunningham (1966) CQ 16: 113, and (1971) *Herodas*, Oxford: 145–46. Cf. O. Weinreich (1909) *Antike Heilungswunder*, Giessen: 31; Herzog 131; Edelstein & Edelstein 2.188; Siefert 324, 327; Kern (1938) 3.154–55.
- 109 Cf. Siefert 328.
- 110 Avaricious man: Liban. *Declam.* 34.36; clay cocks: van Straten 87–88.
- 111 Callim. *Epigram.* 548; cf. van Straten 70–72.
- 112 LSCG *Suppl.* 107.10–13, 16–18; cf. van Straten 78; LSCG 43.
- 113 *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.14–15.
- 114 Paus. 3.26.1.
- 115 Oropos: Paus. 1.34.4; Athens: Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 2.103.225.
- 116 Diog. Laert. 6.59; Cic. *Nature of the Gods* 3.37.89; K. Lehmann (1962) *Samothrace 4.1: The Hall of the Votive Gifts*, New York: 95–96; D. Wachsmuth (1967) *Pompimos ho Daimon*, Berlin: 141–42.
- 117 See Hyde 21–24 (dedication of prizes), 24–32 (of statues).
- 118 REG (1967) BE no. 697 (Ebert 251–55; Moretti (1970) 295–96; CEG I.394; 600? BC; Miller (1979) 73, misunderstanding the inscription in asking how a victor could dedicate a tithe of one-tenth of an olive wreath).
- 119 Statue base: IG I<sup>3</sup> 835 (Raubitschek 156, no. 2; DAA 111); three Olympic victories in the chariot-race: schol. Ar. *Clouds* 64, dated by

# NOTES

- Olym.* 164, 169, 176 to 500, 496, 492; Kyle 203–04 A31 and *APF* 7826V doubt that he had three victories.
- 120 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 880 (*DAA* 174; *CEG* I.278; c. 450–440 BC; Raubitschek 158–59; Kyle 210 A57). For chariot statue groups at Olympia, see Hyde 264–74.
- 121 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 823 (Raubitschek 156–57, no. 4; *DAA* 76; *IAG* 11; *CEG* I.265; Kyle 153 n. 174); Hdt. 8.47; Paus. 10.9.2.
- 122 The dedication of a son of Kallaischros, for two victories at the Isthmia and two at Nemea: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1022 (Raubitschek 157–58, no. 7; *APF* 8792VI, p. 327; Kyle 214 A74, 215 A78; c. 440–403 BC).
- 123 Lyk. *Leok.* 51.
- 124 E.D. Francis & M. Vickers (1981) *PCPhS* 207 (n.s. 27): 114–15.
- 125 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1469 (*IAG* 5; Ebert 3; *CEG* I.302; Hdt. 6.125.5; *LSAG* 73, 78 n. 30; Friedländer 167; Kyle 196 A6; Dillon & Garland 100). For a dedication by Alkmeonides with another individual, see *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 597 (Raubitschek 155 n. 1; *DAA* 317; *IAG* 4; *LSAG* 73, 77, 401 pl. 3 n. 25; Kyle 205 A38): a Doric capital dedicated by ‘—os and Alkmeonides’, which would have carried a metal bowl.
- 126 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 584–88 (*LSAG* 91, 94, 402, pl. 7, nos 3a–e).
- 127 C. Smith (1896) *JHS* 16: 343 (notice of discovery).
- 128 E.R. Gebhard in Coulson 76.
- 129 Paus. 6.10.7–8; Friedländer 101.
- 130 Paus. 6.14.6.
- 131 For example, Paus. 6.10.9, and book six, *passim*.
- 132 *CEG* I.362 (D.W. Bradeen (1966) *Hesperia* 35: 320; Friedländer 103; *IAG* 3; *LSAG* 148, 150, 405, pl. 24 no. 5; Ebert 2; *M&B* 130; Miller (1990) 37 fig. 11; c. 560 BC).
- 133 Paus. 2.1.7.
- 134 Paus. 6.13.9, 6.14.13; Hyde 27 with n. 21, 29.
- 135 Hyde 30–31.
- 136 Luc. *On Images* 11; for exceptions, see Hyde 45–46.
- 137 Above n. 118.
- 138 Discussed by Kurke 141–49.
- 139 Paus. 5.21.1, 25.1, 6.1.1–2.
- 140 Various scholars argue that the athletic statues were dedications at least to the end of the fifth century; see, however, S. Lattimore (1988) in S.J. Brandy (ed.) *Coroebus Triumphs*, San Diego: 245–56, esp. 248. On whether athletic statues were dedications, see W.H.D. Rouse (1902) *Greek Votive Offerings*, Cambridge: 167–68; Hyde 37–40; Lattimore 248–55. It needs to be noted that when Pausanias was writing, all statues appeared with dedicatory formula: he is not referring to his own day (Hyde 39; Lattimore 248).
- 141 *IvO* V 142, 143, 178, 194, 197, 217, 236; Hyde 37 nn. 10–11; cf. Lattimore 249. Paus. 6.1.1 is taken as drawing a distinction between athletic statues, as not being dedications, and equestrian ones.
- 142 For example, *IvO* V 144 (Ebert 16, but see Lattimore 250–51; after 472 BC); 145 (Ebert 69; fifth century); 147–48 (472 BC); 149 (Ebert 9; 460 BC); 150 (fifth century); for other examples, see Hyde 38 n. 5; Paus. 6.18.7 explicitly refers to the dedication of two statues of



# NOTES

- athletes for victories in 544 and 536 BC, while 6.8.2 quotes the dedicatory inscription of Damarchos.
- 143 *LSAG* 191, 199 no. 20 (*IAG* 8; Ebert 9; Finley & Pleket pl. 15b; *M&B* 148; 550–525 BC).
  - 144 Probably mid-sixth century: W. Peek (1976) *ZPE* 23: 78; *SEG* 18, 140; 22, 207, 26, 407; E.R. Gebhard in Coulson 76.
  - 145 *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 988 (c. 575–550? BC), for victory in the jump (see Gardiner (1910) 298 fig. 60; Friedländer 55; *IAG* 1; Kyle 201 A22; *M&B* 147), probably in the Eleusinia, which attracted panhellenic contestants: Pind. *O.* 9.99, 13.110, *I.* 1.57.
  - 146 Hdt. 1.144.2–3. Hdt. 5.60 (Friedländer 42a): a tripod dedicated in the temple of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes for a boxing victory.
  - 147 *IvO* V 717 (E.N. Gardiner (1907) *JHS* 27: 1–2; *IAG* 2; *M&B* 109); cf. *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 15 (dedication of a lifted stone weighing 668 pounds). See also an inscribed stone on Thera, weighing 330 pounds: Friedländer 56; N.B. Crowther (1977) *G&R* 24: 111–20.
  - 148 *Works and Days* 650–59; the ancient view that these lines are an interpolation is probably incorrect: M.L. West (1978) *Hesiod. Works and Days*, Oxford: 319; pace S. Benton (1934–35) *ABSA* 35: 114, tripods won in contests could be and were taken away.
  - 149 Paus. 9.31.3; *LSAG* 91, 94, 402, pl. 8 no. 6 (c. 625–600 BC).
  - 150 *Anth. Pal.* 6.140; Friedländer 99.
  - 151 J. Neils in Neils: 49–50.
  - 152 Zen. 6.11; cf. Fontenrose 217–18, n. 27.
  - 153 Epidauros: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 21; Pergamon: *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.2–14.
  - 154 NT *Mt.* 6.1, cf. 23.5.
  - 155 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* esp. 478–79; Mylonas 224–29; Parke (1977) 56; Burkert (1983) 248–56.
  - 156 Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1050–53; cf. Ar. *Frogs* 321–22.
  - 157 Paus. 1.38.7 (Eleusis), 1.14.3 (Eleusinion), 9.25.5–6 (Boeotia); note also 4.33.5 (Andania); Hdt. 2.171.1–2.
  - 158 Eleusis: Ael. F58.8; Asklepios: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 11.
  - 159 Ael. F12; Suda s.v. *hierophantes*.
  - 160 Ar. *Birds* 1073–74; Diod. 13.6.7; the Arab source Al-Mubassir (tr. in *FGH* 3b *Suppl.* 1.198; cf. L. Woodbury (1965) *Phoenix* 19: 188–90); Suda s.v. *Diagoras*; Krateros *FGH* 342 F16; Melanthios *FGH* 326 F3; *FGH* 3b, *Suppl.* 1.199–201, *Suppl.* 2, 165–67. On the date of Diagoras' impiety, see *FGH* 3b, *Suppl.* 1.199–201; see also F. Jacoby (1959) *Diagoras*, Berlin.
  - 161 Andoc. 1.28, cf. 1.12, 31.
  - 162 Thuc. 6.27–29, cf. 60–61; Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.14; Plut. *Alk.* 19–22; Andoc. 1.11–12, 16–17; Clem. *Protrep.* 2.11; Isoc. 16.6: the city would be as angered if anyone parodied the mysteries as by attempts to overthrow the democracy; cf. Andoc. 1.36. Note also the case of Andocides: Andoc. 1; [Lysias] 6; D.M. MacDowell (1962) *Andokides. On the Mysteries*, Oxford: 167–71.
  - 163 Andoc. 1.71; [Lys.] 6.9, 24; see MacDowell 200–03.
  - 164 Luc. *Demon.* 11; Hor. *Odes* 3.2.25–29 (for the Eleusinian Mysteries

## NOTES

- in the Roman period, see esp. L.J. Alderink (1989) *ANRW* 2, 18.2: 1457–98; K. Clinton (1989) *ANRW* 2, 18.2: 1499–539).
- 165 Livy 31.14.7–9; cf. Ael. F58.8; Diog. Laert. 2.101; Samothrace: *LSCG Suppl.* 75, 75a.
- 166 Paros: *LSCG* 109 (fifth century); Boeotian shrine of the Kabeiroi, Demeter and Kore: Paus. 9.25.5, 9.
- 167 Diod. 5.77.3; Burkert (1983) 252.
- 168 Arist. *Nik. Eth.* 1111a; Ael. *Var. Hist.* 5.19; Aeschyl. F218 (Dindorf); Clem. *Strom.* 2.14; Herakleides F170 (Wehrli); for Aeschylus as undergoing initiation in the mysteries in the underworld: Ar. *Frogs* 886–87; see Mylonas 227; D.F. Sutton (1983) *Hermes* 111: 250–51.
- 169 Paus. 1.38.7.
- 170 Macrobian. *Comm. Somn. Sc.* 1.2.19; Burkert (1987) 85, 160 n. 113.
- 171 Burkert (1983) 253; cf. Mylonas 227 n. 13. Note, however, the increasing hieronymy of the hierophant (the personal name of an official was not given, only the title of the priestly office which he held, and his patronymic and demotic), first evidenced in the fourth century BC (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1934); see Clinton (1974) 9–10.
- 172 *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1078.
- 173 *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 479.
- 174 A new fragmentary inscription of the second century BC; see I. Loucas & E. Loucas (1994) in R. Hägg (ed.) *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, Stockholm: 99. Perhaps the inscription refers to entry to the shrine rather than initiation, as it is known from *LSCG* 68 (third century BC) that women breastfeeding could not be initiated.

## 7 THE FEMALE PILGRIM

- 1 Ar. *Lys.* 636–46; Eur. *Melanippe Captive*, *LP* 108–15, 8–17.
- 2 *IG* XII, 8.218 and 220a, 1, with Cole (1984) 42.
- 3 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 4.
- 4 *LSCG* 65.15–28, specifically on their clothing.
- 5 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 31; Herzog 73.
- 6 Plut. *Alex.* 2.2; Cole (1984) 17, 110 n. 127 rejects this as a ‘literary cliché’, along the lines of stories in which lovers first meet at festivals or funerals.
- 7 Callim. *Hymn Dem.* 130–31 with N. Hopkinson (1984) *Callimachus: Hymn to Demeter*, Cambridge: 179–80; cf. Burkert (1987) 37.
- 8 Dionysos at Bryseai (Lakonia): Paus. 3.20.3; Demeter: Paus. 8.36.6; Kore: 8.31.8; Hippodameion: 6.20.7; Demeter Mysia: 7.27.9–10; note also Poseidonios *FGH* 87 F56. For female-only cults, see M. Detienne (1977) *Gardens of Adonis*, New Jersey, (1989) in M. Detienne & J.-P. Vernant (eds) *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*, Chicago: 129–47; S.G. Cole (1991) *Helios* 19: 104–22, (1995) 183–84.
- 9 Paros: Hdt. 6.134–35; deme festival: *LSCG* 18A. 48–50, D.37–38; Methymna: *LSCG* 127 (fourth century BC); Cole (1995) 184 n. 14.
- 10 All the dates are BC: *LSCG Suppl.* 56 (Delos, second century BC), 63

# NOTES

- (Thasos, c. 440), 88 a and b (Lindos; a: fourth century, b: second century), 89 (Lindos, fourth century); *LSCG* 82 (Elataia, end of the fifth century), 96.9 (Mykonos, c. 200), 109 (Paros, fifth century), 124.11–12 (Eresos, second century); *LSAM* 42a (Miletos, c. 500); restored in *LSCG Suppl.* 66 (Thasos, fourth century); Paus. 3.22.7, 7.5.8; Plut. *Mor.* 300d–301a, 403f; Strabo 14.6.3; Phylarchos *FGH* 81 F33; Cole (1991) 105, (1995) 183; R. Osborne (1993) *CQ* 43: 397–98.
- 11 Cole (1995) 183–84.
  - 12 See Parker (1983) 32–103, 322–23; Burkert (1985) 79, 378 n. 45. At Hesych. s.v. *hagneuein*, purification by abstinence from sex and avoiding contact with a corpse belong to the same category; see also Porph. *de Abst.* 2.19, 4.16; Cole (1995) 188.
  - 13 Pergamon: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 982.3–9 (second century BC), tr. Grant 6; holy water for purification: Parker (1983) 226–27, 371; cf. the Philadelphia cult regulations: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 985.25–51 (first century BC), tr. Grant 28–30.
  - 14 *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, no. 161.13.
  - 15 *LSCG* 68.11–13 (third or second century BC); cf. Parker (1983) 49. A new fragment of another sacred Lykosouran law mentions a waiting period before women could be initiated after childbirth: A.P. Matthaiou & Y.A. Pikoulas (1986) *Horos* 4: 75–78 (second century BC); cf. I. Loucas & E. Loucas (1994) in R. Hägg (ed.) *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, Stockholm: 97–99; cf. above, p. 269 n. 174. Paus. 8.37.2 saw cult regulations inscribed at Lykosoura.
  - 16 Arist. *Pol.* 1335b 12–16; cf. Callim. *Hymn Dem.* 130–33.
  - 17 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iamata 1–2; Paus. 2.27.1, 6.
  - 18 *LSCG* 69.43–47.
  - 19 Didactic tales: Hdt. 9.116–20; Paus. 8.5.12; cf. Parker (1983) 74 with n. 3 for further references; Egyptians: Hdt. 2.64.1.
  - 20 Hes. *Works and Days* 733–34; Parker (1983) 76–77; Cole (1995) 188.
  - 21 Cyrene: *LSCG Suppl.* 115 (discussed by Parker 342); Epidauros: *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 14.
  - 22 Cf. Burkert (1987) 108.
  - 23 Dio Chrys. 77/78.4, cf. 35.15.
  - 24 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 31.
  - 25 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 1; cf. Herzog 71–75.
  - 26 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 2. The iamata involving females are discussed by Herzog 71–75; O. Weinreich (1909) *Antike Heilungswunder*, Giessen: 28–30; Siefert 329–30.
  - 27 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iama 31; cf. *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22 iamata 3, 41.
  - 28 *I. Cret.* 1, 17, no. 9.5–11.
  - 29 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iamata 34, 39, 42.
  - 30 Andromacha: *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 31; Aratos: Paus. 2.10.3, 4.14.8; Herzog 37, 42, discusses possible epigraphic evidence for the involvement of the serpent in this case, noting also Plut. *Arat.* 2.4, 24.1, 53.1–6, esp. 5–6. Aratos was born in 270 BC.
  - 31 Weinreich 95; cf. 93–94 n. 1.
  - 32 Ar. *Wealth* 733–36; cf. Weinreich 95–97, 99.
  - 33 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22 iamata 17, 33.
  - 34 *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 121 iama 4.

# NOTES

- 35 Lebeña: *I. Cret.* 1, 17, 9.5–11.
- 36 Eur. *Ion* 299, cf. 334–35. This seems to contradict Plut. *Mor.* 385c; see Fontenrose 217 n. 26 with references; R. Flacelière (1965) *Greek Oracles*, London: 41.
- 37 Eur. *Ion* 303.
- 38 Eur. *Ion* 220–29.
- 39 *FD* 3.1.560 (end of the fourth century BC).
- 40 Paus. 10.4.3; Plut. *Mor.* 364e, 365a; cf. Paus. 10.6.3–4, 10.19.4, 10.32.7; Hom. *Od.* 11.581; E. Marbach (1935) *RE* 6a: 684–91; Burkert (1983) 124–25.
- 41 Plut. *Mor.* 249e–f.
- 42 Plut. *Sol.* 8.4; cf. Aen. *Tact.* 4.8.
- 43 Eur. *And.* 597–99; Paus. 3.13.7; Plat. *Rep.* 452a–b, *Laws* 7.804e, 8.833c; Plut. *Lyk.* 14.3, *Mor.* 227d; note Sappho F73 (Edmonds); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 802 (*IAG* 63); cf. *IAG* p. 168.
- 44 Paus. 5.6.7, 5.13.10, 6.20.9; cf. Burkert (1983) 102–03. Harris 183 thinks 6.20.9 (parthenoi *not* prohibited) is a corrupt passage, and that the negative should be dropped, but the three passages in question draw a distinction between gynaikes and parthenoi; cf. H. Kempe (1936) *LKE* 55: 281–82.
- 45 Paus. 5.6.7–8; Philostr. *Gymn.* 17; hypoth. c. Pind. *O.* 7 (Drachmann 1.197); Harris 123.
- 46 Paus. 5.16.2–4; for the sixteen women, see 5.16.2–8.
- 47 Cf. F.M. Cornford (1912) in J.E. Harrison (ed.) *Themis*, Cambridge: 229–31. For women in Greek athletics, see Harris 179–86; R.B. Kebric (1989) *Greek People*, California: 60–61; T.F. Scanlon in Raschke 185–216; N.B. Crowther (1985–86) *CW* 79: 124–25; Sweet 134–44.
- 48 Paus. 6.23.3; Burkert (1983) 102; F. Graf (1984) *ZPE* 55: 253.
- 49 Paus. 3.8.1, 3.15.1, 5.12.5, 6.1.6; Xen. *Ages.* 9.6; Plut. *Ages.* 20.1, *Mor.* 212b. She is praised in an inscription at Olympia: *IvO* V 160 (*Anth. Pal.* 13.16; *CEG* II.820; Ebert 33; *IAG* 17); *IG* V 1, 235, a Doric capital, bears Kyniska's name at Sparta. For her victories in 396 and 392, see Cartledge 29, 115, cf. 145, 149, 260; cf. Hyde 367.
- 50 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 802 (*IAG* 63), tr. Harris 180, and Miller (1991) 106; H. Langenfeld (1976) in R. Renson (ed.) *The History, the Evolution and Diffusion of Sports and Games in Different Cultures*, Brussels: 116–25; cf. J. Fontenrose in Raschke 135–36.
- 51 Plut. *Mor.* 675b.
- 52 Phintys 591–92 (H. Thesleff (1965) *Pythagorean Texts*, Abo).
- 53 *LSCG* 65.13–26. For clothing requirements in Greek cults, see H. Mills (1984) *ZPE* 55: 255–65; P. Culham (1986) *ZPE* 64: 235–45; for bare feet, cf. *LSCG* 68.6–7; *LSCG* 136.25–27; J.N. Bremmer (1984) *ZPE* 55: 277 and n. 46.
- 54 Philostr. *Apoll.* 8.7 (5).
- 55 *LSCG* 65.24.
- 56 *LSCG* 68. For this inscription, see also Guarducci 4.20–23; I. Loucas & E. Loucas (1994) in R. Hägg (ed.) *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, Stockholm: 97–99.
- 57 Female theoroi for the Olympian festival at Ephesos were not religious

# NOTES

- ambassadors for the festival but rather spectators: L. Robert (1974) *CRAI*: 176–82; R. Merkelbach (1977) *ZPE* 24: 178.
- 58 Women as theorodokoi: Perlman 22–23.
- 59 Nikagora: Paus. 2.10.3; Thersandros: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 122 iama 33.
- 60 *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1, 121–22 iama 5, 8, 20, 26; a father on behalf of a lost boy: iama 24.
- 61 *LSCG* 65.17, 20, 21.
- 62 Burkert (1987) 52, with 151 n. 115.
- 63 Porph. *Abst.* 4.5; *SEG* 30, 61A.41 (the selection of the ‘child of the hearth’, with Clinton (1980) 285); F. Sokolowski (1959) *HTHR* 52: 3; Mylonas 236–37; Clinton (1974) 98–114; Burkert (1983) 254, 280, (1987) 52, 151 n. 115.
- 64 Pind. *O.* 8, 10, 11, 14, *P.* 10, *N.* 4, 5, 6, 7; contestants from: Aegina, western Lokri, Orchomenos, Thessaly; events: wrestling, boxing, running, pankration; Bacchyl. 1, 2, 6, 7 (cf. *IG* XII 5.608), 11, 13 (cf. Pind. *N.* 5); festivals: Isthmia, Olympia, Pythia; contestants from: Keos, Metapontion (Italy); events: boxing or pankration, running and wrestling.
- 65 Olympic age categories: N.B. Crowther (1988) *Phoenix* 42: 304–08. *IvO* V 56 (first or second century AD) concerning the Sebastia, a festival at Naples, has been restored to give two age categories, but P. Frisch (1988) *ZPE* 75: 179–85, and N.B. Crowther (1989) *ZPE* 79: 100–02 (cf. (1988) 304), propose new restorations to provide for three categories.
- 66 Paus. 6.14.2 (where Eleians is a reference to hellanodikai); *Anth. Pal.* 12.255, with N.B. Crowther (1988) *Phoenix* 42: 305.
- 67 Olympia: Paus. 6.14.1–2; Smyrna: Paus. 6.14.2–3.
- 68 *LSCG Suppl.* 38 A and B.
- 69 Plut. *Mor.* 304e.
- 70 Plut. *Mor.* 293c, 417f–418d, 1136a; Theopompos *FGH* 115 F80 (Ael. *Var. Hist.* 3.1); Callim. *Iamb.* 4 F194 (Pfeiffer 34–36); hypoth. Pind. *P. c.* (Drachmann II.4); Ephoros *FGH* 70 F31b; Hdt. 6.34.2; cf. Paus. 4.12.6; Parke & Wormell 1.8; Fontenrose (1959) 453–54; C. Sourvinou-Inwood (1979) *CQ* 29: 234; Burkert (1983) 127–30.
- 71 [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 54.7; Ar. *Peace* 873–76.
- 72 Hesych. s.v. *arkteia*; schol. Ar. *Lys.* 645 (Leiden & Ravenna schol.); Harp. s.v. *arkteusai* (Krateros *FGH* 342 F9).
- 73 See for the vases L. Kahil (1965) *AntK* 8: 20–33, (1981) *Hesperia* 50: 253–63; R. Hamilton (1989) *Hesperia* 58: 449–53.
- 74 Arist. *Enquiry into Animals* 581a; D. Amundsen & C. Diers (1969) *Human Biology* 41: 125–32.
- 75 C. Sourvinou-Inwood (1971) *CQ* 21: 339–42, and (1988) *Studies in Girls’ Transitions*, Athens: 15, 68 n. 1, emends Aristophanes’ text, similarly T.C.W. Stinton (1976) *CQ* 26: 11–13; P. Perlman (1983) *GRBS* 24: 117–20 correctly rejects such manipulations of the text; even Sourvinou-Inwood (1988) 68 n. 1 accepts that the girls *look* more than 10.
- 76 Rakos: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1514–18, 1523–24; N. Robertson (1995) *AncW* 26: 200–01; cf. R. Osborne (1985) *Demos*, Cambridge: 170; Hippokrates *On Virgins* 8; but note S.G. Cole (1984) *ZPE* 55: 239 n. 33.

## NOTES

- 77 See Parker (1983) 100–03, 353–54.
- 78 Clothing: Eur. *Iph. Taur.* 1449, 1464–67; cf. Hippokrates *On Virgins* 17; blood-letter: Arist. *Enquiry into Animals* 581 a31–b2.
- 79 T. Linders (1972) *Studies in the Treasure Records of Artemis Brauronia Found at Athens*, Stockholm, for IG II<sup>2</sup> 1514–31.
- 80 Paus. 1.23.7; procession: Ar. *Peace* 874.
- 81 Compulsory: schol. Ar. *Lys.* 645 (Ravenna); Suda s.v. *Arktos e Brauroniois*; before marriage: Harp., Suda, Anec. Bekk. s.v. *Arkteusai*; schol. Ar. *Lys.* 645 (Leiden & Ravenna).
- 82 Cf. M.B. Walbank (1981) CQ 31: 277; H. Lloyd-Jones (1983) *JHS* 103: 93.
- 83 L. Kahil (1981) *Hesperia* 50: 253–63, and for the arkteia, (1977) *AntK* 20: 86–98; W. Sale (1975) *RbM* 118: 265–84; Parke (1977) 139–40; Simon 83–88; R.S.J. Garland (1984) *ABSA* 79: 88–89; Osborne 157–72; R.S. Kraemer (1992) *Her Share of the Blessings*, Oxford: 22–23; K. Dowden (1989) *Death and the Maiden*, London: 25–32, (1992) *The Uses of Greek Mythology*, London: 102–06.

## 8 ORGANISATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

- 1 Menander F481 (Kock).
- 2 See ch. 1, n. 109.
- 3 SEG 30, 61A.31–33 (cf. 34–35); cf. *Hesperia* (1941) 10: p. 67, l. 28.
- 4 LSCG 69.13–20, esp. 13–16.
- 5 For abstinence from wine as part of cult regulations, see above, pp. 163–4.
- 6 Knidos: LSAM 55 (c. 350 BC, Dillon (1990) 87); Delphi: CID 3 (fifth century BC): see J. Fontenrose in Raschke 129, 139 n. 23 (incorrect interpretation); Miller (1991) 73; P. Aupert in Coulson 68–69, with fig. 4; athletes: Philostr. *Gymn.* 51, cf. 47–49.
- 7 FD 3.1.357–58; Dillon (1990) 64–76.
- 8 Paus. 5.15.1–3; L.H. Kraynak (1984) *Hostelries of Ancient Greece*, PhD thesis, Berkeley: 49–57, esp. 56.
- 9 See the plan in A. Mallwitz (1971) *AA*: 154+.
- 10 For the date of the Leonidaion, see Mallwitz (1972) 252.
- 11 Andoc. 4.30.
- 12 For the Epidaurian katagogion, see Burford (1969) 77, 83; Kraynak 63–73, 180–81 n. 149.
- 13 See IG IV<sup>2</sup> 1 122 iama 31 for a royal dignitary, Andromacha of Epeiros, at Epidauros.
- 14 For details, see Kraynak 117–22.
- 15 Thuc. 3.68.3; cf. Nilsson (1955) 829.
- 16 HCT 2.358.
- 17 Kraynak 122–47, esp. 140–47, with references; Miller (1989) 91, (1990) 96–103 (100 fig. 31), 168–70, (1992) 82.
- 18 O. Broneer (1939) *Hesperia* 8: 182–83; cf. L. Robert (1940) *Hellenica*,

# NOTES

- vol. 1, Paris: 43–53; Harris 158; D.J. Geagan (1989) *Hesperia* 58: 352–55; Kraynak 108–16.
- 19 [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.17–18.
- 20 See Nilsson (1957) 341, cf. (1955) 828; Burkert (1985) 67, 107.
- 21 Dionysios: Diod. 14.109.1–3; Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 29–30; *Lys.* 33; Plut. *Mor.* 836d; Hiero: Plut. *Them.* 25.1; flimsy tents: Paus. 10.32.15, cf. J.A.O. Larsen in Frank 477–78; de Ligt 67–68.
- 22 *SEG* 27, 545.
- 23 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 422.9–11.
- 24 *LSCG* 65.34–37.
- 25 *LSCG* 65.37–39, cf. 39–45, 75–84, 112–114.
- 26 *LSCG Suppl.* 43.3–7.
- 27 *LSCG* 65.35–36; cf. Nilsson (1955) 828–29.
- 28 Henioch. F5 (*PCG* 5.556–57).
- 29 Andoc. 4.30; Athen. 534d; Plut. *Alk.* 12.1; cf. Thuc. 6.16.2; Isoc. 16.32–35; W.M. Ellis (1989) *Alcibiades*, London: 51. Cf. Plut. *Them.* 5.4.
- 30 Ael. *Var. Hist.* 4.9.
- 31 Ar. *Peace* 879–80, with schol. 879; Dillon (1990) 81 n. 36.
- 32 Unpublished inscription; see P. Siewert in Coulson 116.
- 33 Luc. *Hdt.* 8.
- 34 Xen. *Anab.* 5.3.9; cf. Nilsson (1955) 828; Burkert (1985) 67.
- 35 *RC* 3.2–4.
- 36 Magnesia: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 685.81–82 (139 bc); Samos: *LSCG Suppl.* 81.7–8 (first century AD).
- 37 Thuc. 2.17.1–2 (cf. 1.143.5, 144.4; 3.81.3, 5), 2.13.2, 14, cf. 52.3; note also the Athenians sleeping armed in the Theseion in 415, in case of a possible Spartan attack: Thuc. 6.61.2.
- 38 Delion: Thuc. 4.97.2–98.8; cf. Parker (1983) 162; Agesilaos: Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.2, *Ages.* 5.7; Plut. *Ages.* 22.1; cf. Thuc. 1.134.1–3, 5.16.2. Sanctuaries as camps for armies: Thuc. 3.96.1, 6.44.3, cf. 5.66.1, 7.29.3.
- 39 Paus. 2.27.6.
- 40 Asklepios' sanctuary: Paus. 10.32.12; Isis' sanctuary: 10.32.13; cf. 10.34.7: dwellings in the precinct of Athena for the priests.
- 41 *LSCG* 37 (see Guarducci 4.18–19). For regulations governing beasts at sacred sites, see the references at *LSCG* 116, p. 211 and *LSCG* 104 p. 199.
- 42 Delphi: *LSCG* 79; Ios: *LSCG* 105.
- 43 *Hesperia* (1941) 10: p. 67, no. 31.39; cf. *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 229–38 with F. Sokolowski (1960) *TAPhA* 91: 376–80; *LSCG* 136. Sacred regulations concerning vehicles, beasts, fires, dung, trees, pasturing and sowing are dealt with by M.P.J. Dillon, forthcoming *ZPE*.
- 44 Ar. *Wealth* 1013–14 (388 bc); Lykourgos: Plut. *Mor.* 842a–b, *Comp. Nik. & Crass.* 1.3; Ael. *Var. Hist.* 13.24.
- 45 *LSCG* 65.78–80; cf. 108–09; bathing at Olympia: Epict. 1.6.26.
- 46 *LSCG* 37 (end fourth century bc); cf. Callim. *Hymn Dem.* 36–60. Note Sokolowski *LSCG* 37, p. 72; B. Jordan & J. Perlin (1984) in K.J. Rigsby (ed.), *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow (GRBS Suppl.* 10): 153–59; note also Parker (1983) 165, 335; R. Meiggs (1982) *Trees*

## NOTES

- and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Oxford: 378. On deforestation, see R. Sallares (1991) *The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World*, London: 35–36, 496–97 n. 234.
- 47 LSCG 100.4–5 (fifth century BC), tr. D.G. Rice & J.E. Stambaugh (1979) *Sources for the Study of Greek Religion*, Chico: 124; other prohibitions on lighting fires in sacred areas: IG I<sup>3</sup> 4b.6–11, 14–15 (LSCG 3; Athens, 485/4 BC, the ‘Hekatompedon decree’); LSCG 67.21 (Tegea, fourth century BC); LSCG 112.3 (Paros, second century BC); LSCG Suppl. 43.3 (largely restored, Delphi, 218 BC); LSCG Suppl. 111.12 (Tymnos, first century BC); LSCG Suppl. 105.3 (Kamiros, Roman period).
- 48 Thuc. 4.133.2–3.
- 49 LSCG 65.36–37.
- 50 Hdt. 6.75.3.
- 51 See G. Panessa (1983) *ASNP* 13: 359–87 for water distributed by sacred sites to local communities; cf. G. Argoud (1985) in J. Fossey & H. Giroux (eds) *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities*, Amsterdam: 9–24; S.G. Cole (1988) in R. Hägg *et al.*, *Early Greek Cult Practice*, Stockholm: 161–65.
- 52 Luc. *Peregrin.* 19; cf. Epict. 1.6.26; Mallwitz 149–55.
- 53 S.G. Miller (1980) *Hesperia* 49: 203, (1990) 35–36, 172–79 (a similar channel at Epidauros: 172 n. 105).
- 54 Dillon (1996) 192–93.
- 55 Burkert (1985) 86, with references at 377 n. 2, 382 n. 31.
- 56 LSCG 65.103–11; the fountain as a place of sacrifice: 84–89.
- 57 See esp. de Ligt & de Neeve 392–96, de Ligt 35–39 on the definition of panegyris as a ‘religious festival’ and rejecting (correctly) L. Roberts’ suggestion that panegyris refers to the ‘economic’ aspect of a festival.
- 58 Paus. 9.39.8; LSCG 65.22–23.
- 59 See ch. 3 n. 24.
- 60 LSCG 65.99–103; cf. R. MacMullen (1981) *Paganism in the Roman Empire*, New Haven: 165 n. 44.
- 61 IG II<sup>2</sup> 1013 (c. 100 BC; H.W. Pleket (1964) *Epigraphica*, vol. 1, Leiden: 14.45–49).
- 62 *I. Ilion* 3.
- 63 SEG 32, 450; 38, 377 (late third century BC).
- 64 Diog. Laert. 8.8; cf. Iamb. *Pyth.* 12.58; Epict. 2.14.23–25; Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* 5.3.9.
- 65 Dio Chrys. 27.5. Justin 1.3.5 referred to *mercatus Olympicus*, indicating a commercial aspect for the festival.
- 66 Dio Chrys. 8.9; Menander F481 (Kock); Olympia: Diog. Laert. 8.8; Herakl. Pont. ap. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.9; Iamb. *Pyth.* 12.58; Vell. Pat. 1.8.1; Justin 13.5.3.
- 67 *LSAM* 54 (date unknown).
- 68 Strabo 10.5.4; de Ligt & de Neeve 393; R. MacMullen (1970) *Phoenix* 24: 336; cf. Paus. 10.32.15.
- 69 Athen. 172f–173a.



# NOTES

- 70 *LSCG Suppl.* 45.31–34 (after 217 bc); de Ligt & de Neeve 405, 412; cf. de Ligt 245.
- 71 de Ligt 68.
- 72 Text: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 729 (*FD* III.2.139); Pleket (1964) 13; tr. J.A.O. Larsen in Frank: 332–33; see R. Bogaert (1968) *Banques et banquiers dans les cités Grecques*, Leiden: 115–16; C. Howgego (1992) *JRS* 82: 18; de Ligt 65, 243.
- 73 *SEG* 27, 545 (second half of the third century bc); C. Habicht (1972) *Ath. Mitt.* 87: 191–228; G. Daux (1975) *ZPE* 19: 138; G. Dunst (1975) *ZPE* 18: 171–77; L. Koenen (1977) *ZPE* 27: 211–16; F. Sokolowski (1978) *ZPE* 29: 143–47; G. Thür & H. Taeuber (1978) *AAWW* 115: 205–25; G. Shipley (1987) *A History of Samos*, Oxford: 215–18.
- 74 Cf. de Ligt 64, 245–46.
- 75 T.R.S. Broughton in Frank: 870, 899; MacMullen (1981) 25; cf. R. Lane Fox (1986) *Pagans and Christians*, New York: 68.
- 76 *LSCG Suppl.* 45.31–34.
- 77 de Ligt & de Neeve 411–13; de Ligt 225–29.
- 78 *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 56–60, 535–37; cf. *Plut. Mor.* 409a.
- 79 Cf. A. Burford (1972) *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society*, London: 78.
- 80 C. Risberg (1992) in T. Linders & B. Alroth (eds) *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World*, Uppsala: 34, nn. 16–17.
- 81 For itinerant craftsmen, see Morgan (1990) 37–39, and (1993) in N. Marinatos & R. Hägg (eds) *Greek Sanctuaries*, London: 23.
- 82 Morgan (1990) 39; Miller (1990) 31.
- 83 Paus. 2.27.6, cf. 1; C. Habicht (1985) *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*, Berkeley: 10 with n. 53, cf. 177.
- 84 See above, p. 257, n. 2.
- 85 Kos: *LSCG* 154b.17–32 (third century bc); Kreousa: *Eur. Ion* 1118, see also 1222–25; cf. *Thuc.* 1.134.3–4.
- 86 Brophy 363–90; Brophy & Brophy 171–98; M. Poliakoff (1986) *AJPh* 107: 400–02; Adshead 57–58. Note Paus. 8.40.1–2 (Arrachion's dead body proclaimed victor).
- 87 Brophy & Brophy 172.
- 88 *IAG* 29; Ebert 44; cf. *IG* IX.2 249; see Brophy & Brophy 172–77.
- 89 Paus. 6.9.6–8 (496 or 492 bc). For Kleomedes, see *Olym.* 174; Brophy & Brophy 177–82. Delphi later announced that Kleomedes was to be honoured as a hero.
- 90 Brophy & Brophy 181–82 identify Kleomedes' transgression as the use of the outer edge of his palm in a 'chop' to his opponent's chest, which fractured a rib piercing the lung.
- 91 See also the case of Kreugas of Epidamnos (Paus. 8.40.3–5).
- 92 Brophy 363–90; Brophy & Brophy 189.
- 93 *BCH* 88 (1964) 186–87; E. Segal (1984) *Journal of Sport History* 11: 25–31; Brophy & Brophy 189–90.
- 94 *IvO* V 56.25.
- 95 B.F. Cook (1966) *Inscribed Hadra Vases in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York: 25, no. 10, also 1, 3, 7, 8; cf. Boesch 88, 134–35. *Ark. Delt.* 23b (1967) 39 (*SEG* 25, 244), fourth century bc, is a

# NOTES

fragment of a loutophoros, with an inscription commemorating the positions which this individual held: θεωρὸς Ἀμφικτύονος / Διομειεύς. He was possibly a theoros sent to announce the Pythian festival.

- 96 *I. Iliou* 3 (c. 200 BC).
- 97 *SEG* 27, 510.15–17 (third century BC).
- 98 Philostr. *Apoll.* 5.43; John Chrys. *MPG*, vol. 51, col. 76; Burkert (1983) 102 n. 43; Paus. 5.21.12–13.
- 99 Paus. 5.24.9 (athletes); 6.24.3 (hellanodikai); cf. Gardiner (1910) 202, (1930) 223; Harris 176, cf. 175; Finley & Pleket 61, 63–65.
- 100 Paus. 5.21.18.
- 101 *Olym.* 884; *LAG* 79; tr. in R.S. Robinson (1955) *Sources for the Study of Greek Athletics*, Chicago (repr. 1981): 198–99.
- 102 Abstinence: Philostr. *Gymn.* 22, 45, 48, 52 (wet-dreams as harmful at 49, 52, cf. *SEG* 9, 72 (*LSCG Suppl.* 115), with Parker (1983) 342); Ikkos: Plato *Laws* 839e–840a; cf. Diog. Laert. 8.9 (sex injurious to health); J.A. Arieti (1975) *CW* 68: 431–36; Burkert (1983) 61 n. 13, 102 n. 43; Parker (1983) 84; Cole (1995) 182. ‘Dog-tie’: Poll. *Onom.* 2.4.171; Phrynichos *Praeparatio Sophistica* s.v. *kynodesmai*; E.C. Keuls (1985) *The Reign of the Phallus*, Berkeley: 68–70, with figs 50–51; W.E. Sweet (1985) *AncW* 11: 46–52, (1987) 129–32; Aeschyl. *Theoroi* 29–31, with H. W. Smyth & H. Lloyd-Jones (1957) *Aeschylus*, vol. 2, London: 544.
- 103 Paus. 6.7.10; Porph. *Pyth.* 15; Iamb. *Pyth.* 5.25; Philostr. *Gymn.* 43, 44, 50; on athletic life in general: Arist. *Pol.* 1338b 9–38 (cf. N.B. Crowther (1988) *Phoenix* 42: 306–07); J.M. Renfrew in Raschke 174–76.
- 104 Pind. *I.* 5.57–58; see also 6.10.
- 105 Paus. 5.24.9.
- 106 Paus. 5.21.2; cf. Philostr. *Gymn.* 45 for bribery; Gardiner (1910) 134–35, 174, (1930) 103; J. Wiesner (1942) *RE* 18.1: 150; Hyde 34.
- 107 Paus. 5.21.4. Other statue bases of the Zanes had similar injunctions: Paus. 5.21.6–7.
- 108 Paus. 5.21.8–9, 12–17; 6.3.7 records a case of hellanodikai who were fined for giving a false judgement.
- 109 Paus. 5.21.5–7; Plut. *Mor.* 850b (contra Pausanias, that Hypereides won the case); Hyp. F32.111, F32.112 (Kenyon); cf. Parke (1967a) 116.
- 110 *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1076: διὰ τὸ φθείρειν τοὺς ἀγῶνα (third century BC); cf. Luc. *Nero* 9; Philostr. *Gymn.* 45.
- 111 S.G. Miller (1979) *Hesperia* 48: 96, (1990) 186.
- 112 One month’s training at Elis: Philostr. *Apoll.* 5.43; cf. Paus. 6.23.1; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1073.19–21.
- 113 Paus. 5.21.12–14.
- 114 D.R. Jordan & A.J.S. Spawforth (1982) *Hesperia* 51: 65–68 (*SEG* 32, 364) Roman imperial period; Jordan (1994) *Hesperia* 63: 111–15 (116–25 for curse tablets against athletes).
- 115 *ARV*<sup>2</sup> 401.3 (500–475 BC); Gardiner (1910) 436 fig. 151; Hyde 241 fig. 55; *M&B* 179; M.B. Poliakoff (1987) *Combat Sports in the Ancient World*, New Haven: 55 fig. 53.

# NOTES

- 116 Hdt. 8.59; cf. Plut. *Them.* 11.3.
- 117 Unpublished inscription; see P. Siewert in Coulson 114–15; Richardson (1992) 230; Paus. 6.4.3.
- 118 Pankrationist: Paus. 5.21.18; Theogenes: 6.6.4–6.
- 119 Dikon: Paus. 6.3.11; Sotades: 6.18.6; Astylos: 6.13.1.
- 120 *IvO* V 56; I. Ringwood-Arnold (1960) *AJA* 64: 246–47; R. Merkelbach (1974) *ZPE* 15: 192–93; P. Frisch (1988) *ZPE* 75: 179–85; N. Crowther (1989) *ZPE* 79: 100–02; Siewert 113–17 n. 2; tr. in Robinson 162–63, & Miller (1991) 140.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works which have been consulted but not cited are not listed; works referred to once or twice in the Notes appear only there.

- Adshead, K. (1986) *Politics of the Archaic Peloponnese. The Transition from Archaic to Classical Politics*, Aldershot.
- Aleshire, S. B. (1989) *The Athenian Asklepieion: the People, their Dedications, and the Inventories*, Gieben.
- Amandry, P. (1950) *La mantique Apollinienne à Delphes*, Paris.
- Arbesmann, P. R. (1929) *Das Fasten bei den Griechen und Römern*, Giessen.
- Bill, C. P. (1901) 'Notes on the Greek theoros and theoria', *TAPhA* 32: 196–204.
- Boesch, P. (1908) *ΘΕΩΡΩΣ: Untersuchung zur Epangelie griechischer Feste*, Göttingen.
- Bowra, C. M. (1935) *Pindari Carmina*, Oxford.
- Broderson, K. (1991) 'Heiliger Krieg und Heiliger Friede in der frühen griechischen Geschichte', *Gymnasium* 98: 1–14.
- Brophy, R. H. (1978) 'Deaths in the pan-hellenic games: Arrachion and Creugas', *AJPh* 99: 363–90.
- and Brophy, M. (1985) 'Deaths in the pan-hellenic games II: all combative sports', *AJPh* 106: 171–98.
- Bruneau, P. (1970) *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris.
- Burford, A. (1969) *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros*, Liverpool.
- Burkert, W. (1983) *Homo Necans. The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, tr. P. Bing, Berkeley.
- (1985) *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, tr. J. Raffan, Oxford.
- (1987) *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Harvard.
- Cartledge, P. (1987) *Agesilaos and the Crisis of Sparta*, London.
- Caspari, M. O. B. (1915) 'The Ionian Confederacy', *JHS* 35: 173–88.
- Casson, L. (1991) *The Ancient Mariners: Seafarers and Sea Fighters of the Mediterranean in Ancient Times*, 2nd edn, Princeton.
- (1994) *Travel in the Ancient World*, 2nd edn, Baltimore.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Clinton, K. (1974) *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Philadelphia.
- (1980) 'A law in the city Eleusinion concerning the Mysteries', *Hesperia* 49: 258–88.
- Cole, S. G. (1984) *Theoi Megaloi: The Cult of the Great Gods at Samothrace*, Leiden.
- (1995) 'Women, dogs, and flies', *AncW* 26: 182–91.
- Coulson, W. and Kyrieleis, H. (eds) (1992) *Proceedings of an International Symposium on the Olympic Games*, Athens.
- Davies, J. K. (1967) 'Demosthenes on liturgies: a note', *JHS* 87: 33–40.
- de Ligt, L. (1993) *Fairs and Markets in the Roman Empire*, Amsterdam.
- and de Neeve, P. W. (1988) 'Ancient periodic markets: festivals and fairs', *Athenaeum* 66: 391–416.
- Deubner, L. (1900) *De incubatione capita quattuor*, Leipzig.
- (1932) *Attische Feste*, Berlin.
- Dillon, M. P. J. (1990) '“The house of the Thebans” (FD iii.1 357–58) and accommodation for Greek pilgrims', *ZPE* 83: 64–88.
- (1993) 'Restoring a manuscript reading at Paus. 9.3.7', *CQ* 43: 327–29.
- (1994) 'The didactic nature of the Epidaurian iamata', *ZPE* 101: 239–60.
- (1995) 'Phrynon of Rhamnous and the Macedonian pirates: the political significance of Sacred Truces', *Historia* 44: 250–54.
- (1996) 'The importance of the water-supply at Athens', *Hermes* 124: 192–204.
- 'Sacred laws concerning the environment of the Greek sanctuary', *ZPE* (forthcoming).
- and Garland, L. (1994) *Ancient Greece: Social and Historical Documents from Archaic Times to the Death of Socrates*, London.
- Dindorf, W. (1832) *Aeschyli tragoediae superstites et fragmenta*, Oxford.
- Dodds, E. R. (1951) *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley.
- Drachmann, A. B. (1903–27) *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, vols 1–3, Leipzig.
- Ebert, J. (1972) *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*, Leipzig.
- Edelstein, E. J. and Edelstein, L. (1945) *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*, vols 1–2, Baltimore.
- Edmonds, J. M. (1922) *Lyra Graeca*, vol. 1, London.
- Farnell, L. R. (1896–1909) *The Cults of the Greek States*, vols 1–5, Oxford.
- Ferguson, J. (1989) *Among the Gods: an Archaeological Exploration of Ancient Greek Religion*, London.
- Finley, M. I. and Pleket, H. W. (1976) *The Olympic Games: The First Thousand Years*, London.
- Fontenrose, J. (1959) *Python: A Study of the Delphic Myth and its Origins*, Berkeley.
- (1988) *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions*, Berkeley.
- Foucart, P. (1914) *Les mystères d'Éleusis*, Paris.
- Frank, T. (ed.) (1938) *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. 4, Baltimore.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Friedländer, P. and Hoffleit, H. B. (1948) *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse*, London.
- Gardiner, E. N. (1910) *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, London.
- (1930) *Athletics of the Ancient World*, Oxford.
- Giovannini, A. (1969) *Étude historique sur les origines du Catalogue des Vaisseaux*, Paris.
- Graham, A. J. (1983) *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 2nd edn, Chicago.
- Grant, F. C. (1953) *Hellenistic Religions: The Age of Syncretism*, Indianapolis.
- Guarducci, M. (1978) *Epigrafia Greca*, vol. 4, Rome.
- Harris, H. A. (1964) *Greek Athletes and Athletics*, Connecticut.
- Helly, B. (1973) *Gonnoi*, vols 1–2, Amsterdam.
- Herzog, R. (1931) *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Religion*, Leipzig.
- and Klaffenbach, G. (1952) 'Asylieurkunden aus Kos', *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften Zu Berlin*: 1–30.
- Hyde, W. W. (1921) *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art*, Washington.
- Kaibel, G. (1899) *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vol. 1.1, Berlin.
- Kenyon, F. G. (1907) *Hyperidis Orationes*, Oxford.
- Kerényi, C. (1960) *Asklepios: Archetypal Image of the Physician's Existence*, tr. R. Manheim, London.
- (1967) *Eleusis: Archetypal Image of Mother and Daughter*, tr. R. Manheim, New York.
- Kern, O. (1927) *Die griechischen Mysterien der klassischen Zeit*, Berlin.
- (1926, 1935, 1938) *Die Religion der Griechen*, vols 1–3, Berlin.
- Kock, T. (1880–84) *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*, vols 1–2, Leipzig.
- Krug, A. (1984) *Heilkunst und Heilkult. Medizin in der Antike*, Munich.
- Kurke, L. (1993) 'The economy of kudos', in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds) *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*, Cambridge: 131–63.
- Kyle, D. G. (1987) *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, Leiden.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1976) 'The Delphic Oracle', *G&R* 23: 60–73.
- Magie, D. (1950) *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ*, vols 1–2, Princeton.
- Mallwitz, A. (1972) *Olympia und seine Bauten*, Munich.
- Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L. (1967) *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, Oxford.
- Mikalson, J. D. (1975) *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*, Princeton.
- Miller, Stephen G. (1975) 'The date of Olympic festivals', *Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut* 90: 215–31.
- (1979) *Arete: Ancient Writers, Papyri, and Inscriptions on the History and Ideals of Greek Athletics and Games*, 1st edn, Chicago; see also (1991).
- (1982) 'Kleonai, the Nemean games, and the Lamian war', in *Hesperia Suppl. 20: Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography*, Princeton: 100–08.
- (1988) 'The theorodokoi of the Nemean games', *Hesperia* 57: 147–63.
- (1989) 'Nemea and the Nemean games', in *M&B*: 89–96.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1990) *Nemea: a Guide to the Site and Museum*, Berkeley.
- (1991) *Arete: Greek Sports from Ancient Sources*, 2nd edn, Berkeley; see also (1979).
- (1992) 'The stadium at Nemea and the Nemean games', in Coulson 81–86.
- Moretti, L. (1970) 'Supplemento al catalogo degli Olympionikai', *Klio* 52: 295–303.
- (1992) 'Nuovo supplemento al catalogo degli Olympionikai', in Coulson 119–28.
- Morgan, C. (1989) 'Divination and society at Delphi and Didyma', *Hermathena* 147: 17–42.
- (1990) *Athletes and Oracles. The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC*, Cambridge.
- Mosley, D. J. (1973) *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*, Wiesbaden.
- Mylonas, G. E. (1961) *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton.
- Nauck, A. (1889) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 2nd edn, Leipzig (suppl. B. Snell (1964) Hildesheim).
- Neils, J. (ed.) (1992) *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, Princeton.
- Nilsson, M. P. (1955) *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, Munich.
- (1957) *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung*, Stuttgart.
- Parke, H. W. (1967a) *Greek Oracles*, London.
- (1967b) *The Oracles of Zeus*, Oxford.
- (1977) *Festivals of the Athenians*, London.
- Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- (1985) 'Greek states and Greek oracles', in P. A. Cartledge and F. D. Harvey (eds) *Crux: Essays in Greek History Presented to G. E. M. de Ste Croix*, London (= *History of Political Thought* 6): 298–326.
- Pearson, A. C. (1917) *The Fragments of Sophocles*, Cambridge.
- Perlman, P. J. (1984) *The 'Theorodokia' in the Peloponnese* (unpubl. PhD thesis), California.
- Petropoulou, A. (1981) 'The Eparche documents and the early oracle at Oropus', *GRBS* 22: 39–63.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1949) *Callimachus*, vol. 1, Oxford.
- Pleket, H. W. (1974) 'Zur Soziologie des antiken Sport', *Mededelingen van het Nederlandsch Instituut te Rome*, n.s. 36: 56–87.
- Popp, H. (1957) *Die Einwirkung von Vorzeichen, Opfern und Festen auf die Kriegführung der Griechen im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Würzburg.
- Pritchett, W. K. (1971) *The Greek State at War*, vol. 1, Berkeley.
- (1980) *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography. Part III: Roads*, Berkeley.
- Raschke, W. J. (ed.) (1988) *The Archaeology of the Olympics. The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*, Wisconsin.
- Raubitschek, A. E. (1939) 'Leagros', *Hesperia* 8: 155–64.
- Rhodes, P. J. (1981) *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford; with suppl. (1993).
- Richardson, N. J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1992) 'Panhellenic cults and panhellenic poets', in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd edn, vol. 5, 223–44.
- Rose, V. (1886) *Aristoteles: Fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- Rougemont, G. (1973) 'La hiéroménie des Pythia et les ("trêves sacrées") d'Eleusis, de Delphes et d'Olympie', *BCH* 97: 75–106.
- Salmon, J. B. (1984) *Wealthy Corinth*, Oxford.
- Sandbach, F. H. (1969) *Plutarch's Moralia*, vol. 15, London.
- Schachter, A. (1981) *Cults of Boiotia*, vol. 1, London.
- Schweigert, E. (1939) 'Greek inscriptions', *Hesperia* 8: 1–47.
- Siefert, H. (1980) 'Inkubation, Imagination und Kommunikation im Antiken Asklepioskult', *Katathymes Bilderleben*, Wein Huber: 324–45.
- Simon, E. (1983) *Festivals of Attika: An Archaeological Commentary*, Wisconsin.
- Smarczyk, B. (1990) *Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik und politischen Propaganda Athens im Delisch-Attischen Seebund*, Munich.
- Sordi, M. (1984) 'Il santuario di Olimpia e la guerra d'Elide', in M. Sordi (ed.) *I santuari e la guerra nel mondo classico*, Milan: 20–30.
- Sweet, W. E. (1987) *Sport and Recreation in Ancient Greece: A Sourcebook with Translations*, Oxford.
- Travlos, J. (1971) *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, London.
- van Straten (1981) 'Gifts for the Gods', in Versnel 65–151.
- Versnel, H. S. (ed.) (1981) *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden.
- Wehrli, F. (1953) *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Basel.
- Weniger, L. (1905) 'Das Hochfest des Zeus in Olympia. III: Der Gottesfriede', *Klio* 5: 184–218.
- Young, D. C. (1983) 'Professionalism in archaic and classical Greek athletics', *AncW* 7: 45–51.
- (1984) *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics*, Chicago.





# INDEX

*The plural of Greek terms is put in brackets after some entries; e.g.: theoros (pl. theoroi).*

- Abai in Phokis 80, 97, 164
- abaton (pl. abata), xi, 76, 77, 78, 79, 158–9, 171, 188, 189, 190
- abstinence: from food xiv, 61, 62, 65, 67, 91–2, 93, 139, 163–4, 187, 206; *see* sexual intercourse: abstinence
- Abydos 133
- accommodation xv, 8, 12, 14, 15, 43, 160, 161, 206–11; *see* katogogion, Leonidaion, tents, xenon
- Achaeans 26, 54, 102, 116, 152
- Acharaka 152, 163
- Acharnai 25
- Achilles 69, 96
- Actium 139, 216, 217
- Adeimantos 224
- Adrastos 88
- Adriatic 33
- adyton, 67, 83, 86, 91
- Aegean 25, 26, 29, 71, 74, 169
- Aegina 17, 32, 75, 139, 145; *see* Bassidai
- Aelian 178, 210
- Aelius Aristides 41
- Aeneas 82
- Aeolians 91
- Aeschines 3, 4
- Aeschylus 83, 155, 180
- Aetolians, Aetolian League 7, 10, 13, 19, 21, 23, 26, 33, 34, 49, 57, 124, 138, 149, 150, 179
- African oracles 86–7
- Agamedea of Keos 190
- Agathos Daimon 220
- age 96, 185–6; *see* athletes: age categories
- Agessilaos 40, 41, 43–4, 195, 211
- Agessipolis 6, 49–50, 89, 94, 97
- Agis 22
- agonothetai 134–5, 200, 208
- agora (pl. agorai) 63, 138, 173, 179
- agoronomos (pl. agoranomoi) 134, 214, 215, 221
- Agrai 62, 168
- Aigeiroi 38, 56
- Aigion 152
- Aigle 95
- aischrologia *see* Eleusinian (Greater) Mysteries: geophryismos
- Akarnania, Akarnanian league 13, 26, 139, 179, 216, 217
- Akeson 172
- Akmatidas of Sparta 108, 175
- akoniti ('without dust') 108, 175
- Akraiphia 164, 215
- Akrocorinth 160
- Akrorians 47
- Akrotatos 113
- Alalkomenai 135

# INDEX

- Alaric the Goth 70  
 Alektrona 162  
 Alexander I of Macedon 165  
 Alexander II, the Great, of  
   Macedon 42, 91, 130–2, 133,  
   154, 185; Exiles' Decree: 22  
 Alexandria (Egypt) 11, 15, 17, 19,  
   21, 23, 25, 27, 68, 71, 102, 220,  
   221, 224, 225; *see* Clement  
 Alexandria Troas 133  
 Alkibiades 41–2, 117, 119, 122, 178,  
   210  
 Alkinoos 95  
 Alkmeonidai 85  
 Alkmeonides 141  
 altars: at Brauron 201; at the  
   Daidala 137; at Delos: xiii, 126;  
   at Delphi 81, Delphi consulted  
   about 25; at Isthmia 105; lengths  
   of 105; at Nemea 105; at  
   Olympia 45, 105, 107, 108, 194;  
   at Oropos 159, 188; at Pergamon  
   (Asklepieion) 158; of Poseidon  
   at Helike 131; at Samothrace 72  
 Altis 47, 107, 114  
 Amarynthos 139  
 Ambrosia 77, 170, 185  
 Amesinas 121  
 Ammon 25, 39  
 Ammonios of Athens 24  
 Amorgos 213  
 Amphiarraia (festival at Oropos)  
   102  
 Amphiarraion (Oropos) 5, 74, 80,  
   140, 149, 160, 169, 185, 191;  
   abstinence, from food and wine  
   163; accommodation 207–8;  
   bathing 158; dreams 77, 159; fees  
   166–7; iconography of cure 76;  
   journey from Athens 37;  
   misconduct at 205–6; seasons  
   open 79–80, 153; serpents 79;  
   sexual segregation at 188;  
   thanksgiving 172; water supply  
   213–14  
 Amphiarraion (Thebes) 80, 164  
 Amphiarraos *see* Amphiarraion  
 amphiktyony: Delian 127; Troizen  
   138–9; *see* Delphi: amphiktyony  
 Amphilochos 167  
 Amphinastos 170  
 Amphinomos xiii  
 Amphissa, Amphissans 51, 193  
 amphorai *see* Panathenaic  
   amphorai  
 Anacharsis 108  
 anathema (pl. anthemata) 169, 175  
 Anaxandros 106  
 Anaxippos 96  
 Andania 60, 72–3, 149, 152, 177,  
   184, 185; chopping wood  
   212–13; clothing at 162–3, 185,  
   196–8; death at 221; kistai 73;  
   silence required of mystai 73;  
   tents 209; water supply 214  
 Andocides 178  
 Andromache of Epeiros 184, 185,  
   189  
 Andros (Andrian theoria to  
   Delphi) 22, 200, 205  
 Annyla 95  
 Antalkidas 71  
 Anthesterion 2, 62, 156, 168  
 anthippasia 142  
 Antigonos 131, 133  
 Antioch 21  
 Antiocheia in Persia 26  
 Antiocheia in Pisidia 26  
 Antiochos I 92  
 Antiochos III 14  
 Antiochos IV 21, 23, 33  
 Antoninus Pius 219  
 aparchai *see* first-fruits  
 Apelles 195  
 apene *see* mule-cart race  
 apobates 142  
 Apollo x, xi, xii, xiii, 31, 36, 37, 39,  
   50, 51, 53, 74, 75, 81, 82, 91, 93,  
   104, 124, 138, 139, 146, 153–4,  
   158–9, 168, 169, 184; Apollo  
   Archegetes 31; Apollo Dalios 31,  
   264 n. 53; Apollo Ismenios 97,  
   164, 268 n. 146; Apollo Karneios  
   73; Apollo Ptoios 97, 140, 164,  
   173, 215; Apollo Triopios  
   (Triopian Apollo) 133, 148, 175;  
   Phoibos Apollo 126, 173;

# INDEX

- Pythian (Delphic) Apollo 21, 81, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89  
 Apollonia *see* Delia  
 Apollonios (of Alexandria, 'Sprinkler') 30, 108, 115, 224  
 Apollonios (of Tyre) 77, 197  
 apples 114  
 Apulia 158  
 Aratos 3, 28, 54–5, 190  
 Arcadia, Arcadians, Arcadian league 41, 47–9, 73, 102, 116, 139, 170, 181  
 Archidamos I, Spartan king 195  
 Archinos 246 n. 108  
 architheoros (pl. architheoroi) 12, 21, 22, 126, 127; election of 16–17; expenses 18; payments to 18–19  
 archon basileus 62  
 Areiopagos 142, 179  
 Ares 25, 104  
 aretalogiai 79  
 arete 79, 223  
 Argeios of Keos 102  
 Argives, Argos 26, 43–5, 49–50, 54–6, 75, 88, 94, 97, 99, 101, 102, 112, 113–14, 115–16, 150, 165, 199; honours Thracian theorodokos 24  
 Aristagora of Troizen 75  
 Aristides 28  
 Aristippos 54  
 Aristis 174  
 Aristodama 190  
 Aristogeiton 116, 243 n. 63, cf. 173  
 Aristomache of Erythrai 112, 196  
 Ariston 85  
 Aristophanes 64, 69, 76, 94, 144–5, 178, 181, 183, 191, 201–2, 210  
 Aristotelian *Athēnaion Politeia* 126, 143  
 Aristotle 18  
 Arkesine 150, 151  
 arktoi *see* bears  
 armistice of 423/2 38–40  
 arrephoria 18  
 Arrhichion 115  
 Artaphernes 130  
 Artemis 5, 13, 15, 21, 152, 210; Artemis Amarynthia 139; Artemis Brauronia 201–2; Artemis Skillous 140  
 Artemision 90  
 Arybbas, king of Epeiros 185, 189  
 asebeia 178; *see* impiety, sacrilege  
 Asia Minor xi, xiv, 26, 27, 29, 53, 71, 72, 74, 91, 92, 93, 107, 124, 125, 128, 129, 133, 140, 147–8, 152, 158, 184, 199, 217, 219  
 Asklepieia (festival): Epidauros: 101; *see* Kos: Asklepieia  
 Asklepieia (sanctuaries of Asklepios): procedure at 76; relationship with doctors 76; *see* Athens, Epidauros, Kos, Lebena, Pergamon, Rhodes: Asklepieion  
 Asklepios xi, 15, 20, 28, 56, 63, 73–81, 87, 153, 158–60, 163, 169–72, 178, 184, 189, 211; character of 80; cult adapted by Christianity 80, 247 n. 129; father of Aratos 190; spread of cult 63, 75, 76, 78, 199  
 Asopos 136–8  
 asphaleia 3, 28, 54  
 assassination 52, 53, 116  
 Assos 133  
 Asterios 68  
 Astylos of Kroton 226  
 Astypalaia 146  
 asyilia (inviolability) 3, 8, 9–11, 26, 27–9, 32, 53, 54, 57–8  
 Athamanians 34  
 Athena 117, 133, 142, 143, 145, 150, 176, 187, 188; Athena Areia 25; Athena Nikephoria 21; Athena Parthenos 142; Athena Polias 142  
 Athenaëus xii  
 Athens, Attika xii, 15, 26, 33, 35, 49, 51, 71, 73, 75, 88, 89, 99, 100, 114, 124–5, 139, 140, 150, 155, 178, 179, 180, 192, 193; acropolis 118, 142, 145, 150, 173–4, 175, 176, 202; allies 21, 144–6, 208; altar of the 12 gods 36; architheoros (pl. architheoroi) 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 126, 127; Asklepieia 76, 169, 171, 172, 247 n. 129, cf. 78; boule

# INDEX

- 10, 16, 17, 21, 70; colonists  
143–4, 145–6; consults Delphi  
45, 86, 90; consults Dodona 39,  
94; consults Siwah 39;  
dedications at the Ptoion (at  
Ptoios) 97, 140–1; demes 24, 25,  
143, 145, 186; demos 19, 21;  
ekklesia 17; empire 125, 141–5;  
eponymous archon 16; navy 29,  
33, 90; privileges and prizes for  
panhellenic victors 116–17;  
roads to Corinth and Olympia  
36; in Sacred Wars 50–2; theoria  
to Delos 16, 18–19, 22, 25, 125–8;  
theoriai and theoroi 13, 16, 17,  
21, 23, 25; tribes 89; tribute of  
allies 144; *see* Delia, Dipylon  
Gate, Erechtheion, Kerameikos,  
Panathenaia, Pythais, Pythaistai,  
spondophoroi, tetrapolis,  
Thesmophoria
- athletes, athletics xi, xii, 20, 81, 125,  
156, 176, 204; accommodation  
208; age categories 101, 112, 113,  
121, 200; as amateurs? 116,  
120–2; athletic circuit 99–100,  
218; banishment 226; best 109;  
biting by 101; bribery 106, 119,  
204, 223–4; change city 226;  
colonies, founders (oikistai) of  
119–20; cowardice 225; critics  
of 116; (Solon reduces rewards)  
117–18, 256 n. 97; ‘crooked’  
223; deaths of 109, 220;  
dedications by 117, 132–3, 226;  
diet 222; dining privileges 116,  
118; disqualification 220, 224;  
expenses 222; eye-gouging by  
101, 224; families of 100; financial  
allowances 226–7; fines 106, 108,  
206, 222–4; finger-breaking  
224–5; girls as 194–6; graffiti 113;  
heroized 120; iselastic  
(triumphal) entries of 118; kudos  
118; lack of 108; as military  
commanders 119–20;  
‘nicknames’ 220, 224; nudity 100,  
194; number of victories 101;  
place-getters 117–8; political  
careers 118–19; prayers of 106,  
123, 220; punishment of 224–5;  
renown 118; sexual abstinence  
222; socio-economic status  
119–22, 175; Socrates on 116; as  
sons of deities 120; Spartan 109,  
119; statues 174–5, 226; statues  
as dedications? 175; talismanic  
power of athletes? 119–20;  
training period (at Olympia) 3,  
30, 34, 221–2; ‘twice defeated,  
twice victorious’ 43; wine 206;  
withdraw from competition 108,  
222; Xenophanes’ opinion  
117–18; *see* akoniti (‘without  
dust’), Kallias (son of  
Didymios), Kimon the Elder,  
Milon, periodonikai,  
Theogenes, trainers, victory  
fillets
- Aulis 176  
aulos (flute) 101  
autumn 30, 61  
Axieros, Axiokersa, Axiokersos 71
- Bacchylides 101–2, 139, 200  
baggage 37  
Bakchoi (Bacchants) 151, 206  
barbarians (barbaroi) 21, 52, 53,  
100, 164; *see* Gauls, Persian  
Wars
- bare-feet 96, 197, cf. 96  
bare-heads 199  
barley 61, 65  
Bassidai of Aegina 100  
baths, bathing xv, 55, 83, 91, 108,  
158–9, 161, 214, 215  
Battos 120  
bay crown 114  
bears 201–2  
Bendis 39  
Bessoï 83  
birth *see* childbirth  
birthdays 132, 142, 153  
Bithynia 25  
Black Sea x, xiv, 75, 93, 128  
blindness 170  
blood 188  
boar’s flesh 223

# INDEX

- boat-race 101, 142
- boats *see* ships
- Boedromion 2, 6, 29, 62, 63, 69, 70, 156, 164
- Boeotia, Boeotians xi, 26, 37, 39, 40, 46, 97, 102, 124, 135, 137, 138, 140, 148, 150, 152, 154, 164, 173–4, 178, 179, 211
- bones, of heroes 88, 111
- bonfire 136, 148
- boots, *see* footwear
- Borysthenes x
- Boukatios 3
- boxers, boxing 101, 102, 104, 108, 109, 113, 115, 117, 120, 121, 125, 126, 142, 194, 220, 224, 225
- boy, boys xiv, 22, 226; age category as athletes 101, 112, 113, 121, 200; avoidance of sex with 222; both parents living 114, 201; cured and cures at Epidauros 170–1, 188, 189; financial allowance at Sebastia 226; pentathlon 108; victors 102, 115
- boycotts of festivals 17, 20, 45, 223
- Brauron, Brauronia 160, 201–3; theoria to 25
- Brea 143, 144
- breast-beating 195
- breast-feeding 186, 188
- bride, bridesmaid 136–8
- bridges 35, 37, 62, 65; of boats 127
- Brimo 243 n. 58
- brothel, brothel-keeper 180, 189
- Bryseai 186
- burial *see* funerals
- Bybon 175
- Bysios 3, 153
- Byzantium 144
- cakes 158–9; *see* pelanos
- calendar 11, 50, 133
- Callimachus 128, 168, 185–6
- ‘Camel’, *see* Agathos Daimon
- Cape Kolias 193
- carriages, carts *see* wagons
- Caulonia 226
- cavalry 45–6, 48
- caves xvi, 70, 81, 139–40, 152, 162, 163, 164
- celery crown 114
- centaurs 66, 107
- Ceres 179
- Chabrias 163
- Chaironeia, Chaironeians 40, 135, 150
- Chalkis, Chalkidians 26, 31, 176
- chariots, chariot-racing, equestrian events xii, xiv, 20, 31, 46, 78, 81, 100, 102, 104, 107, 109, 110, 116–20 *passim*, 122, 125, 134, 139, 141, 142, 173–5, 176, 195, 196, 218
- Charonion 152
- cheese, abstinence from 187
- Chersonasita on the Pontos 20
- Chersonese 120
- Chians 13, 17, 19, 23, 40, 43, 75, 93, 129, 155–6
- child, children xi, 163, 184, 189–90; concerns about legitimacy of 95; at Epidauros 200, cf. 177; ‘of the hearth’ in Eleusinian Mysteries 70, 200; as pilgrims 126, 140, 200–1; requests for female offspring 189; requests for male offspring 96, 97, 190; *see* boys, Childbirth, daughters, fathers, girls, mothers, pregnancy, sons
- childbirth xiv, 79, 139, 181, 184, 186, 187, 201–2, 211; death in 202
- childlessness 14, 81, 185, 189, cf. 87
- Chionis of Sparta 120
- Chios *see* Chians
- choregos (pl. choregoi) 126
- chorus, choruses 125, 126, 127, 192
- chresmographion (Didyma) 92
- Christ, as hierophant 68
- Christians, Christianity 58, 61, 65, 66, 67–8, 80, 177
- Chthonia (at Hermione) 232 n. 93
- City Dionysia 125, 144–6
- Claros, oracle of Apollo 93, 94; inscribed responses 93
- ‘Cleft Road’ 37
- Clement of Alexandria 65, 67–8

# INDEX

- Cleopatra, queen of Epeiros 199  
 cleruchs 145  
 clothing xiv, 33, 161–3, 186; at  
   Andania 185, 196–8; Brauron  
   201–2; chitons 197, 201; cloaks  
   197; cost of 197–8; dedication of  
   177, 202; at Delos 127;  
   diaphanous 197; Eleusinian 64,  
   162; of female competitors 195;  
   hypodyma 197; kalasiris 197–8;  
   krokotis 201; at Lebadeia 161–3;  
   linen 161, 197; lion skin of  
   Herakles 66; at Lykosoura  
   198–9; at Mt Ida 139–40;  
   presented to goddesses 56, 142  
   prizes of 116; purple, coloured  
   and black 71, 140, 197, 199; at  
   Samothrace 71; sindonites  
   197–8; white 139, 158, 161, 196,  
   197, 199; width of stripes on  
   197; *see* footwear, nudity, peplos,  
   rakoi, wreaths  
 cocks 63, 171  
 coins 78, 166, 172, 214  
 colonies 141, 143–4, 146–7; *see*  
   Athens: colonists; athletes:  
   colonies  
 competitors x, xiv, 3, 30, 34, 37,  
   42–4, 48, 54, 100–4, 106–7, 122,  
   129, 194–6, 200, 204, 208, 210,  
   215, 220, 222–6; *see* athletes,  
   contests, festivals  
 confession 72, 170  
 contests: age categories at 200;  
   religious nature of 103–6; *see*  
   athletes, crowns, festivals, prize  
   contests  
 Corcyra, Corcyraeans 26, 94,  
   146–7  
 Corinth x, 3, 23, 26, 36, 43, 54–5,  
   62, 102, 111, 112, 113, 125, 139,  
   146–7, 160, 176; Asklepieion 75,  
   166, 169, 171  
 Corinthian Gulf 131  
 couches (including litters) 38, 80,  
   160, 185, 210, 237 n. 55  
 courts 18, 29, 146, 178, 205–6, 208  
 cow, offering at Great Panathenaia  
   143–4, 146  
 craftsmen, itinerant 217–19  
 Crete 23, 26, 74, 126, 139–40, 180;  
   *see* Lebena  
 Croesus 80, 89, 94, 97, 177  
 crops (and harvests) xi, 30–1, 81,  
   87, 192  
 crowds x, xii, 55, 108, 115, 161, 170,  
   179  
 crown contests *see* stephanitai  
   agones  
 crowns 31, 99, 108, 114, 115, 117,  
   120, 195, 201, 220, 224; *see*  
   wreaths  
 crows 135  
 Cumae 82  
 cures xi, xiv, 73–80, 97, 169–72, 177;  
   *see* Asklepieia, Epidauros, Kos,  
   Lebena, Pergamon  
 curse 106, 278 n. 114  
 cushions 197  
 Cybele 71  
 Cyclades 30  
 Cyprus 39  
 Cyrene xiv, 27, 74, 107, 120, 163,  
   176; cathartic law 88, 188  
 Cyrus 89, 129  
 Daidala xi, 135–8, 147–8  
 daidalon (pl. daidala) 135–8  
 Daimon 161  
 Damiskos of Messene 200  
 Damokrates of Tenedos 6  
 Damotimos of Troizen 116  
 Damoxenos 220  
 dances, dancing 69, 104, 126, 142,  
   176, 184, 193  
 Daphni 64  
 Dardanos 133  
 Darius 129  
 daughters 61, 100, 163, 177, 196–7,  
   200  
 Daulis 37  
 dawn 111, 140, 215  
 death 176, 178, 179, 181, 186, 187;  
   of athletes 123, 220; at Delos  
   219–20; at Epidauros 79, 219; at  
   Kos 220; of theoroi 56, 57, 221  
 dedications xiii, 24, 72, 81, 106, 116,  
   117, 122–3, 133, 140–1, 161,

# INDEX

- 169–76, 177, 185, 191, 202,  
217–19; of terracotta body parts  
75, 169
- deer 218
- Deinarchos 22
- Dekeleia 4, 25, 36, 37, 41–2
- Delia 39–40, 125–8, 145, 147, cf. 31
- Delion 211
- Delos xii, xiii, 24, 31, 124–8, 146,  
148, 160; Athenian *theoria* 16,  
17, 25, 126–8; death and burials  
219–20; expulsion and return of  
Delians 88; financial accounts  
127, 128; profits from pilgrims  
128, 216; *see* Delia, Hyperborean  
gifts
- Delphi x–iv *passim*, 5, 14, 21, 24,  
28, 35, 50, 149, 165, 176, 183,  
184, 218, 220, 223, 226;  
accommodation 15, 207, 209;  
ambiguous oracles 89–90, 93;  
amphiktyony 37, 50–1, 53, 56,  
110–11, 189, 209, 216; approves  
laws and constitutional changes  
88–9; armies at 39, 53; Athenian  
consultations 25, 39; attacks on  
51–3; benefits from sacrifices 20,  
168; bias against Athens? 39–40,  
94; bribery 85–6, 94; chasm 82;  
clientele 81, 92; colonisation  
87–8; ‘concerning crops or  
children’ 87, 192; Croesus 80–1,  
177; days for consultation 153–6;  
decline of 87; dedications at 81,  
169, 174, 218; Epidauros  
(support for) 75; fees 167–8;  
fictitious oracles 87; Gallic  
invasion 17, 52; guides 81–2;  
hearth 90; information elicited  
from consultants 86; inscribed  
oracles 92; Jason of Pherai 52;  
lot-oracle 86, 154; lots to  
determine order of consultation  
155; medising? 90; ‘most  
truthful’ oracle 81; non-verbal  
responses 86; oikistes (pl.  
oikistai) 88; oracles on personal  
matters 81, 89–90;  
Peloponnesian War 39, 89;  
Perseus 28, 52–3; Persian Wars  
52, 90; *pneuma* 82; prophetes 84;  
proxenos (pl. proxenoi) 14, 86,  
154–5; questions asked 81, 87,  
89, 90; Spartan consultations 24,  
49–50, 85–6, 88, 89; specific  
responses 15–16, 21, 52, 85, 120,  
145; tents for consuming  
sacrifices in 160; ‘think-tank’? 88;  
Thyiades at 193; travel to 37;  
tripod 82, 154; ‘trivial and  
everyday matters’ 87; women  
consultants 192; ‘wooden walls’  
oracle 90; *see* pelanos,  
promanteia, Pythais, Pythaistai,  
Pythia, Pythioi, Sacred Wars,  
Soteria
- Demandros of Gortyn 76–7
- Demaratos 85
- Demeter 10, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68,  
70, 71, 73, 160, 163, 168, 176,  
178, 179, 184, 186; cures 242 n.  
46; Demeter Chamyne 105, 194;  
Demeter Mysia 186; Kabeiraian  
Demeter 179
- Demetrios of Phaleron 179
- Demetrios of Skepsis 244 n. 72
- Demetrios Poliorketes 49, 156, 161,  
181
- Demodike 172
- Demomeles 35
- Demonax (the Cynic) 64, 179
- Demosthenes 17, 20, 22, 155
- Despoina (‘Mistress’, Lykosoura)  
73, 188, 198
- Diadochoi 131
- Diagoras of Melos 72, 178
- Diagoras of Rhodes 100, 106, 194
- diatater (pl. diatateres) 109, 225
- Diasia 118
- dice, as dedication 169, 171, cf. 78
- Didyma, oracle of Apollo 5, 28,  
91–3, 94, 97, 146, 216;  
Branchidai 91; clientele 92;  
confirm enquirer’s preferred  
course of action 93; Croesus  
80–1; inscribed oracles 92;  
priestess gives oracles 91–2;  
procession 36, 193; subjects of



# INDEX

- inquiries 92–3; written copy of response 92; *see* Molpoi
- Didymeia (festival) 5, 28
- Dikaiarchos 37
- Dikon 225
- Dindymene 152
- dining rooms 160
- Dio Chrysostom x, 67, 103, 189, 215
- Diodoros (Siculus) x, 48, 65, 68, 82, 131, 154, 180
- Diogenes Laertius 179
- Diogenes the Cynic 69, 172
- Diognetos 220
- diolkos 36
- Dione 95, 96
- Dionysia *see* City Dionysia
- Dionysia in the Piraeus 9
- Dionysios, tyrant of Syracuse 49, 54, 103, 209
- Dionysos 111, 186; the Deliverer 152; oracle of 83
- Dioskouroi (Castor and Pollux) 71
- Dipylon Gate 36, 63, 142
- Dirke (river) 152
- discus 2, 101
- doctors 76, 77, 80, 134, 221
- Dodona, oracle of Zeus xiii, 5, 39, 87, 94–7, 128, 183; advice sought on livelihoods 95; bribery 94; clientele 92; Croesus 80–1, 94; inquiries written down on lead tablets 89, 94–7; lot-oracle? 96; myths 96; priestesses 96; private inquiries 95–7; public (state) inquiries 94–5; Selloi 96; ‘will it be better and more good?’ 95
- dogs, cure at Epidauros 78
- Dolonkoi 120
- Dorians xi, 39, 124, 130, 144, 147, 148, 149, 150, 175
- Dorieus 88
- doves 96
- dreams xi, 62, 76–8, 152, 159, 164, 172, 178, 189–90, 211
- Drepanon (Zancle) 88
- drugs, at Eleusis 65–6
- dumbness 170
- Echedoros 170
- Egypt, Egyptians xiv, 7, 25, 91, 102, 107, 109, 188, 197, 220, 221; *see* Alexandria
- ekecheiria 2–3, 5, 19, 41, 104; *see* sacred truces
- ekecheirion 19
- ekkklesia 41
- Elaios 120
- Elaphebolion 2
- Eleians, Elis 3, 4, 31, 35, 41, 44–9, 57, 71, 106, 108, 109, 121, 147, 150, 221, 223
- Eleusinia 2, 6, 13, 61–2, 101–2, 156, 175
- Eleusinian (Greater) Mysteries xi, xiii, xv, 6, 13, 33, 35, 60–70, 141, 146, 149, 152, 153, 161, 163, 184, 185; adyton 67; afterlife 68–9, agrarian cult 60, 65, 68; agyrrhos 62; anaktoron 35, 67, 69, 178; Athenian initiates as pilgrims xv–xvi, 61; better life for initiates 69; bunches of twigs carried by mystai 241 n. 24; cancellation of 42; categories of exclusion 61; ‘child of the hearth’ 70, 200; ‘cleanser of the two goddesses’ 168; Christian writers 61, 66–8; and Cretan mysteries 180; destruction of Eleusis 70; ‘enthronement’ 66; Epidauria 63; epopteia 68, 156; epoptes (pl. epoptai) 68, 156; fasting 61, 65, 67; fees 166, 168; female genitalia 67, 243 n. 55; fines for misconduct 205; first-fruits 21, 145–7; geophyrismos 64–5; Greek speakers only 62, 71, 165; herald (hierokeryx) 62, 165; hiera 35, 62, 63, 67–8; hieronymy of the hierophant 269 n. 171; hierophant 8, 62, 65, 67, 68, 70, 145, 165, 168, 178, 179; hieropoioi 168; ‘Hither the Victims’ 63; Iakchic chant 64; Kallichoron Well 70; kistai 62, 67, 68; krokosis 64; kykeon 65–7; lights 67; Maiden’s Well 70;

# INDEX

- Mirthless Rock 70; mock  
 celebrations of 67, 178–9, cf.  
 180; Mycenaean origin? 69, 243  
 n. 64; number of Athenians  
 initiated 64; Peloponnesian War  
 41–2; pigs 61, 63, 66, 168;  
 Plemochoai 69; Plutonion 70;  
 popularity 61, 64; preliminary  
 initiation at Lesser Mysteries?  
 156–7; ‘priest of the altar’ 168;  
 priestesses 62, 63, 168;  
 procession xv, 4, 25, 35–6, 41–2,  
 62, 63, 63–5; proclamation  
 (prorrhesis) 62; sacred drama 66;  
 sacred land 86, 88; sacred  
 marriage 68; sacred topography  
 70; sacred truce 2–4; silence  
 required of mystai 66, 67,  
 177–81; synthema 65, 67, 68;  
 telesterion 64, 66, 67; ‘to the sea,  
 mystai!’ 63; torch-bearer  
 (dadouchos) 62, 145, 168;  
 torches 66; torture 68; transport  
 to 35, 212; wheat 68; wine 61, 65,  
 69, 163–4; *see* clothing, Demeter,  
 ephebes, Eumolpidai, Kerykes,  
 Kore, mystagogoi, mystai,  
 Persephone, Rheitoi,  
 spondophoroi, Triptolemos  
 Eleusinian (Lesser) Mysteries 62,  
 66, 156–7, 168; sacred truce 2  
 Eleusinion 63, 70, 178  
 Eleutheria 28, 102, 208, 252 n. 34  
 Elysian fields 69  
 emeralds 196  
 entrails (of sacrifice) 97, 161  
 Epainetos 175  
 Epaminondas 69, 73  
 epangelia (announcement) 3, 6, 8,  
 9, 14, 19  
 Epeiros, Epeirotes 18, 26, 75, 184,  
 185, 192, 199  
 Epharmostos 116  
 ephebes 62, 63  
 Ephesia 13, 130–1  
 Ephesians, Ephesos 13, 56, 117,  
 120, 129, 130, 131, 226  
 ephodia (travelling expenses) 19  
 ephors 41  
 Epictetus 108  
 Epidamnos 26, 71, 106, 174  
 Epidauria 33, 102, 196  
 Epidauros xi, xiv, 5, 74–80, 139,  
 146, 149, 153, 159, 161, 169–72;  
 accommodation 207, 211, 219;  
 birth 79, 189–91, 219; children as  
 suppliants 170–191; coins 78;  
 cures (iamata) 74–80, 169,  
 170–2, 177, 185, 188–91, 219;  
 cure by proxy 177; death 79,  
 219; dedications 169–72; dogs  
 cure 78; illnesses cured 75;  
 inscribed lists of cures (iamata)  
 74–80; pinax (pl. pinakes) 74;  
 proportion of men to women  
 191; provenance of suppliants  
 75; scepticism of suppliants 74,  
 77, 79; serpents ‘cause’  
 pregnancies 78–9, 190; serpents  
 cure 78, 191; supplants Triikka  
 74, 75; theorodokoi list 18;  
 tholos, thymele 79; travel to 31,  
 38; unsuccessful visit 79; *see* iama  
 Epigenes 10  
 epinician odes *see* victory odes  
 epiphany 15  
 epitaphs 220  
 equestrian events *see* chariots  
 Eratokles 77  
 Erechtheion 142  
 Eretria, Eretrians 26, 120, 139  
 erga (prizes) 116  
 Erinyes (Furies) 83  
 Erythrai 129, 143, 158, 196  
 escorts, military 23–4, 45–6, 56–7  
 Etesian winds 30  
 ethnic festivals 124–48; ethnic  
 leagues, dissolved 139  
 ethnos (pl. ethne) 5, 124, 125  
 Etna 102  
 Euagoras 174  
 Eualkides 120  
 euandria 117, 142  
 Euboia 37, 102, 121, 128, 139, 176  
 Eukrates 242 n. 46  
 Eumaios xiii  
 Eumenes 13, 53, 131, 132  
 Eumolpidai 6, 7, 8, 10, 168

# INDEX

- Eunapios 70  
eunoia ('goodwill') 8, 21, 24  
Euphrates 14  
Eupolos of Thessaly 223  
Euripides 14; 81, 85, 86, 94, 139, 160, 167, 183, 192  
Eurybiades 224  
Eurynome 152  
Eurytos 57  
Euthymos of Lokri 120, 225  
Exainetos of Akragas 118  
exchange rate 216, cf. 167
- faith healing 76, 80; *see* healing sanctuaries  
famines, oracles sought concerning 88, cf. 81  
fasting *see* abstinence  
Fates 183  
fathers 15, 19, 24, 37, 170–1, 190, 223, 272 n. 60  
feast 60, 137, 160  
fertility 61, 71, 87, 183  
festivals: Athenian empire 141–5; attacks during 41, 55; colonists and 141, 143–4, 146–7; contests and sacrifices at 15, 16, 132; dates of 29, 30–1, 99; economic advantage to local traders 217; entertainment x, xv, 103, 175–6, 215; exclusion from 4, 44–7; neighbourhood 140–1; orators at 103; order of in inscriptions 100; panhellenic participation in 24–6; and treaties 99; *see* boycotts, crowds, markets, panegyris, sacred truces; *see* individual festivals: Amphiaraia, Asklepieia, Brauronia, Daidala, Diasia, Didymeia, Eleusinia, Eleutheria, Ephesia, Epidauria, Gymnopaidiai, Helios (festival of), Heraia (Argos), Heraia (Olympia), Herakleia, Isthmia, Leukophryena, Nemea, Nikephoria, Olympia, Pamboeotia, Panathenaia (Athens), Panathenaia (Ilium), Panionia, Poseidonia, Ptolemaia, Pythia, Sebasta, Sebasteia, Septerion, Sikyon, Soteria, Triopion  
fig-tree 30  
fillet *see* victory fillet  
fines xiv, 150, 205, 206, 214; athletes 108, 222–4, 225; breaking truces 4, 44–7; chopping sacred wood 212–13; proscribed clothing and ornaments 198–9  
fires xv, 55, 90, 105, 212–13; cf. 160; *see* bonfire  
first-fruits (aparchai) 21, 128, 145–7  
fish 163, 170, 215  
Flamininus 112, 166  
flautist 22  
fleece 140, 159  
flies 105, 168  
flute 117, 142; *see* aulos, flautist  
food 163–4, 187, 215; *see* abstinence, wine  
footrace *see* running  
footwear 161–3, 214  
fortune-tellers x, 215  
France x  
frankincense 158  
funerals, funeral processions 139, 176, 187
- Gamelion 2  
Gargara 133  
garlands 33, 50, 64; *see* crowns, wreaths  
Gauls 17, 52  
Gephyraioi 150  
Gerioton 95  
Germanicus 250 n. 201  
gerousia 47  
girls 189, 194; compete at Heraia (Olympia) 194–5; compete at other festivals 196; victors at contests 196  
Glaukos of Karystos 121  
goats: in cults of Asklepios 163, 187; at Delphi 82, 84, 155  
gold 127, 142, 161, 172, 209; gold-cups 31; not to be worn 196, 198  
Gonnos 8, 12, 26  
Gorgias 103

# INDEX

- Gortyn 26, 76, 140  
 graffiti, of athletes 113  
 Great Goddesses 73, 196  
 guides at sacred sites 81–2  
 gymnasium 107, 119, 122, 195, 226  
 gymnastic ('gymnic') events 100,  
 113, 127, 134, 139, 147; *see*  
 boxing, pankration, pentathlon,  
 running, wrestling  
 Gymnopaïdai 150  
 gynaikonomos 186
- Hades 61, 69, 70, 71, 181  
 Hagesidamos 102  
 Hagna 73  
 hair 195, 198–9  
 Halieis 38, 75, 78, 199  
 Halikarnassos 132  
 Halys 89  
 Harma 24  
 Harmodios 116, 243 n. 63, 173  
 harp (kithara) 196  
 Harpine 45  
 harvest *see* crops  
 healing sanctuaries xi, 5, 73–80,  
 153, 157–60, cf. 95; *see*  
 Amphiaraion, Asklepieia,  
 Athens, Epidauros, Kos, Lebena,  
 Pergamon, Troizen  
 heat, at festivals 210, cf. 139  
 Hedeia 196  
 hekatomb 105  
 Hekatombaion 2, 6, 9, 142  
 Hekatomboia 102  
 Helike 57, 131  
 Helikon 176  
 Heliodoros 84  
 Helios 139  
 hellanodikai: Nemea 112–13;  
 Olympia 109, 115, 174, 194, 200,  
 221, 222–3, 225  
 hellanodikaion 222  
 Hellespont 120  
 helots 139  
 Hera 13, 24, 107, 113, 114, 116,  
 137–8, 139, 150, 195, 208, 226  
 Heraia (Argos) 13, 24, 102, 113–14,  
 116  
 Heraia (Olympia) 194–5  
 Heraion (Argos) 24, 160  
 Heraion (Samos) 209  
 Herakleia (city) 75  
 Herakleia (festival) *see* Marathon  
 Herakleia in Trachis (city) 88, 120  
 Herakleidas 95  
 Herakleides of Alexandria 108,  
 115, 224  
 Herakleides the Cynic 37  
 Herakles 2, 21, 57, 84, 93, 107, 113,  
 120; and Eleusinian Mysteries  
 66  
 heralds 6–8, 10, 22, 31, 50, 113; *see*  
 spondophoroi  
 Herkyna 158, 161  
 Hermes 73, 104  
 Hermesianax 196  
 Hermione 75, 139, 232 n. 93  
 Hermon of Thasos 170  
 Herodas 171  
 Herodes Atticus 213  
 Herodotos of Halikarnassos  
 (historian) 32, 36, 37, 44, 52,  
 63–4, 70, 71, 82, 83, 88, 90, 91,  
 94, 96, 97, 103, 109, 120, 128–30,  
 132, 164, 165, 188, 201  
 Herodotos of Thebes 102  
 heroes 88; *see* athletes  
 Hesiod xiii, 30, 95, 96, 139, 176  
 hestiatoria (banqueting halls) 139,  
 160  
 hexapolis 133  
 Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse 49, 54,  
 102, 252 n. 19  
 hieroi agones (sacred contests), *see*  
 stephanitai agones (crown  
 contests)  
 hieromenia 2–3  
 hierophant *see* Eleusinian  
 Mysteries  
 Hipparchos 116, 143, cf. 141  
 Hippias (sophist) 103  
 Hippocratic medicine 76  
 Hippodameia 107, 186  
 Hippodameion 186  
 hippodrome 142  
 Hippolytus 68  
 holocaust 136, 137, 138  
 holy-water 187

# INDEX

- Homer, homeric xi, xiii, 69, 96, 143, 181, 193; *see Iliad, Odyssey*  
*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 124, 126, 129  
*Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 61, 65, 66, 68, 70, 178  
 hoplites 45, 48, 54  
 Horace 179  
 hubris 44, 56  
 hubris 44, 56  
 human sacrifice 124, 137–8  
 husbands 184, 190, 192, 193, 194  
 Hyampolis 152  
 hydria vases 116, 221  
*Hymns to Isyllos* 75  
 Hyperborean gifts 128, cf. 154  
 Hypereides 223, cf. 45  
 hypodyma 197
- Iakcheion, iakchagogos, Iakchos 63–4  
 Ialysos 132, 162  
 iama (pl. iamata: cures) 74, 76–80  
   passim, 159, 169, 170–2, 189, 190, 191; as aretalogiai, 79  
 Iambe 61, 64–5  
 Iamblichos 91–2, 93  
 Ikkos of Tarentum 222  
 Ilas 102  
*Iliad* 18, 96, 129  
 Ilium 133, 221; *see* Panathenaia (Ilium)  
 impiety 10, 21, 28, 116, 178; *see* hybris, sacrilege  
 impurity 66, 94, 187, 188; *see* miasma, purity  
 incense 137  
 incubation (definition) 76; *see* healing sanctuaries  
 Indians 197  
 infibulation 222  
 initiates 29, 60–73, 139–40, 168, 178, 196–8, 200; *see* mystai  
 inns, inn-keepers 37  
 Ino 172  
 Iolaos, tomb of 102  
 Ion, *Ion* 14, 81, 84, 86, 87, 160, 167, 192, 220  
 Ionia, Ionians x, xi, 7, 91, 124–32, 141, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149; contests in 30, 116, 224; *see* Panionia  
 Iphigeneia 202  
 Iphitos 2, 104  
 Isis 152, 211  
 Islands of the Blessed 69  
 Isocrates 51, 62, 122  
 isolympion contests 20, 103, 226  
 isopythion contests 20, 103  
 Isotimides 178  
 Isthmia 11, 28, 40, 100, 101, 102, 107, 111–12, 116, 125, 149, 150, 165, 173, 196, 215, 218, 226; accommodation 208, 210; altar 105; athletic expenses at 222; contests 112; dates 30, 99, 111; dedication of winning chariot 174; dedications 174–5; Dio Chrysostom's description x, 215; disqualification at 224; double celebration 390 42–4; entertainment x, 215; establishment 111, 141; female contestants 196; foundation myth 111; painting competition 112; Peloponnesian War 39–40; ritual chant 111; sacred truce 2, 3, 23; theoriai and theoroi 6, 25; victory crown 114; *see* Melicertes  
 Isthmus 36, 43, 100, 107, 111; *see* diolkos  
 Italy x, 25, 27, 29, 75, 100, 102, 107, 117, 120, 138–9, 147  
 Ithaka 26  
 Ithmonika of Pellana 189
- Jason, high priest 21  
 Jason of Pherai 52  
 javelin 101, 142  
 Judaea 21  
 judges, at contests 114, 115, 224; *see* hellanodikai  
 jugglers 215  
 Julian the Apostate 87  
 jumping 101; jumping weight 175  
 Juno 14  
 Kabeiroi 71

# INDEX

- Kadmeia 41
- kalasiris 197–8
- Kalchedon 133
- Kallaischros 267 n. 122
- Kallias, of Sphettos 17, 19, 21
- Kallias, son of Didymios 100
- Kallias, son of Hipponikos 173
- Kallikrates 95, 96
- Kallipateira 194
- Kallippos 223
- kalpe 108
- kalybai 210
- Kameiros 132
- kapeleia, kapeloi 209, 216–17
- Kaphyiai 75, 192
- Karneia 50
- Karystos, Karystians 121, 128, 139
- Kasmilos 71
- Kassander 136
- Kassotis spring (Delphi) 83
- Kastalian spring (Delphi) 83, 84
- katagogion (pl. katagogia) 207–8
- Keleos 61
- Keos 75, 102, 116, 190, 192
- Kephallenia 26
- Kephisos 35–6, 64
- Kerameikos 142
- Kerykes 6, 7, 8, 10, 168
- Khares (river) 54
- Kimon the Elder 118–19, 122
- Kimon the Younger 39, 111
- King's Peace (387/6) 41
- kings 5, 14, 86, 119, 139; *see*  
     Agesilaos, Agesipolis, Agis,  
     Akrotatos, Alexander I and II,  
     Antigonos, Antiochos I, II, IV,  
     Archidamos, Demaratos,  
     Eumenes, Kleomenes I and II,  
     Nikokreon, Perdikkas, Perseus,  
     Philip II and V, Pleistoanax,  
     Ptolemy II, III, VI
- Kirrha 31, 37, 75
- kithara 101, 117–18, 142; *see* harp,  
     lyre
- Klazomenai 26, 129
- Kleinias 144
- Kleisthenes (Athens) 89
- Kleisthenes (tyrant of Sikyon) 88,  
     111, 141
- Kleitodor 102, 116
- Kleo 79, 169–70, 189
- Kleombrotos of Sybaris 117, 173,  
     174
- Kleomedes of Astypalaia 220
- Kleomenes I of Sparta 54, 85, 113,  
     150, 213
- Kleomenes II of Sparta 55
- Kleonai 54, 57, 112
- Kleosthenes of Epidamnus 106, 174
- Kleotas 95
- Knidos 26, 75, 132, 151
- Knossos (Crete) 139, 180
- Kobon 85
- koimeterion 188
- koinon (league) xi, 26, 129–30,  
     133–5, 148
- Kolophon 129, 146
- Kore 10, 64, 65, 73, 152, 160, 168,  
     176, 178, 179, 184, 186; *see*  
     Persephone
- Koroibos of Elis 121
- Koronaia 135
- Koronis 75
- Korykion cave 81
- Kos 5, 21, 26, 132, 149; Asklepieion  
     (festival) 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15,  
     20, 25, 28, 56, 102, 153, 221;  
     Asklepieion xi, 74–6, 80, 169,  
     172; death at 220; theoria to  
     Delos 31; theoroi and illness 221
- krateriskoi 201–2
- Kratippos 175
- Kraton 15, cf. 207
- Kreousa 14, 81, 86, 87, 192, 220
- Krisa *see* Kirrha
- Krisaia plain 51
- Krokton, krokosis 64
- krokotos 201
- Kronos 104
- Kroton 100, 114, 120, 122, 139, 173,  
     174, 226
- Kteatos 57
- Ktesiphon 32
- kudos 118, 122
- kykeon 61, 65, 66, 67
- Kylon 118, 122
- Kyniska 195
- Kynno 171

# INDEX

- kynodesme *see* infibulation
- Labyadai phratry 201
- Lade 130
- Lakinion 139
- Lakonia, *see* Sparta
- Lamian War 23
- Lampsakos 75, 133
- Laodikeia in Lycia 26
- Lapiths 107
- Lasion 47
- law-suits *see* courts
- lead tablets 89, 94–7, 224
- League of Corinth 55
- League of Islands (Nesiotic League) 15, 19
- Lebadeia (oracle of Trophonios),  
Lebadeians 80, 94, 135, 149, 158,  
161, 164, 181, 192; consultation  
fee 167
- Lebedos 129, 130
- Lebena xiv, 74, 76, 169, 190, 191
- lebes (cauldron; pl. lebetes) 173–4,  
176
- Leimon 140
- leistai, *see* pirates
- Lemnos 145
- Lenaia 145
- Leon 120
- Leonidaion 107, 207
- Leontiskos of Messene 224–225
- Lepreon 4, 44–6
- Leukophyrena 5, 7, 8, 13, 15, 20,  
21, 25–6, 28, 102
- Leukothea 150
- Leuktra 97
- Libya x, 74, 88
- Lichas 46–7, 54, 114
- lightning 24
- Lindos 132
- litter *see* couch
- liturgies 18, 19, 127
- Livy 112, 179
- lodestone 71
- Lokri (Epizephyrii, Italy) 102, 120
- Lokri (Greece) 62
- lots 86, 96, 137, 154–5
- Lovatelli urn 66
- Lucan 82
- Lucian 14, 179
- Lydians 125
- Lykaion 102, 116
- Lykoreia 81
- Lykosoura 60, 73, 149, 177, 184,  
185; clothing at 198–9; name of  
Despoina not to be revealed to  
non-initiates 73; peculiar  
method of sacrifice 73; waiting  
period before initiation 181
- Lykourgos (Athenian orator) 33,  
64, 173, 212
- lyre 101, 110; *see* kithara
- Lysander 71, 86, 94
- Lysanias 95
- Lysias 49, 103
- Macedonia, Macedonians 20, 23,  
26, 28, 29, 32, 51, 53, 71, 87; *see*  
Alexander I and II, Antigonos,  
Philip II, V, Perdikkas, Perseus
- maenads, maenadic ritual 184, 193
- mageiros (pl. mageiroi) 121, 216
- Magnesia, Magnesians 11, 14, 15,  
211; *see* Leukophyrena
- Mantineians 45, 47, 48
- Marathon 32; festival (Herakleia)  
101, 102, 116
- Mardonios 164
- Marios Tyrannos 224
- markets xii, xv, 112, 138, 139, 163,  
173, 214–17
- marriage xi, 81, 87, 95, 201–2
- Massilia x
- Maximus of Tyre 67
- Megakles 141
- Megalopolis 26, 73, 139, 152, 186
- Megara, Megarians 24, 56, 102, 111,  
118
- Meidias 17
- Melanippos 88
- Melicertes 104, 111
- meltemi 30
- Memphis 91
- men, cults exclusive to 186–7
- Menander 205, 215
- menarche 201–2
- Menelaos 69
- menopause 190

# INDEX

- menstruation 201–2
- Mentor of Naupaktos 209
- mercenaries 51
- Messene, Messenia 26, 72, 73, 75, 139, 162, 185, 192, 200
- Metageitnion 2, 3, 9
- Metaneira 65
- Methymna 186
- metopes 107
- mianteres 225
- miasma 187
- Miletos, Milesians 5, 36, 91–3, 121, 129, 131, 146; *see* Didyma
- Milon of Kroton 100, 114, 120, 122, 174
- Miltiades 120, 186–7
- miscarriages 192
- Mnasistratos 73
- Mnemosyne 158
- Molpoi 36, 91
- mothers 61, 177, 185, 188, 189, 190, 199, *cf.* 22; ‘mother polis’ 141; *see* daughters
- Mounichion 29, 201
- Mt Ida 139
- Mt Kithairon 135–7
- Mt Lykaion 139, 152
- Mt Parnassos 52, 193
- Mt Typaion 194
- mule-cart race 108
- Mummius 44
- murderers: debarred from Delphi 84; from Eleusian Mysteries 61, 165
- Muses 176
- musical competitions xi, 20, 22, 81, 110–11, 112, 113, 117, 125, 139, 142–3, 147, 153, 176, 196, 226
- Muslims 58
- Mycenae 55; Mycenaean origin of Eleusinian Mysteries 61, 69
- myesis 61, 157
- Mykale 129, 130
- Mykonos 150
- Myous 129
- Myrlea 133
- Mys 97, 164, 247 n. 31
- mystagogos (pl. mystagogoi) 42, 157
- Mysteries 60–73; *see* Eleusinian Mysteries, Lykosoura, Samothrace
- mystes (pl. mystai: initiates) 42, 60–72 *passim*, 153, 178, 179, 184, 241 n. 24
- Mytilene 26, 75
- Nameless Goddesses 183
- Naples 33, 103, 220, 226
- Nauplion 139
- Nausikaa 126
- Naxos (Aegean), Naxians 127, 163
- Naxos (Sicily) 31
- Nea Polis 23–4, 56–7
- Nemea x, 11, 23, 50, 100, 101, 102, 107, 112–13, 116, 117, 149, 161, 173, 196, 218, 226; accommodation 207–8; altar 105; Athenian architheoros to 23; contestants enslaved 28, 54; contested control of 54–5; contests 113; dates 30, 99, 113; dedications 174; destruction of site 55; establishment of 112, 141; female contestants 196; fines 224; foundation myth 112–13; graffiti 113; hellanodikai 112–13; hieromenia 3; peripatetic nature of festival 54–5; sacred truce 2, 3; stadium 213, 224; statues 224; theorodokia 13, 24; theoriai and theoroi 6, 17, 19, 25; water supply 213; victory crown 114
- neokoros 150, 166, 171
- Neoptolemos 86
- Nero 53, 165
- Nesiotic League, *see* League of Islands
- Niinnion tablet 64, 214
- Nikagora of Sikyon 199
- Nikaos of Athens 13
- Nikasiboula 190
- Nike 95, 96
- Nike (deity: ‘Victory’; pl. Nikai) 101, 114
- Nikeas 95
- Nikephoria 13, 23, 187



# INDEX

- Nikias 16, 22, 119, 126–7; *see* Peace of Nikias  
 Nikokles of Taras 112  
 Nikokrateia 97  
 Nikokreon, king of Salamis 232 n. 77  
 Nikoladas 255 n. 86  
 Nikomachos of Athens 6  
 nomophylarchoi (guardians of the laws) 109  
 nudity: athletes 100, 174, 194; at Brauronia 201–2; trainers 194  
 Numenius 180  
 Nysa 140, 152
- oak trees 135, 136; source of prophecy at Dodona 96  
 oaths 7, 45, 105, 223  
 Odysseus xiii, 69, 126  
*Odyssey* 96, 126  
 Oedipus 37  
 offertory box 158, 166  
 Oibotos 106  
 oikistes (pl. oikistai, founders of colonies) 88, 119–20  
 Oinomaos 107  
 Oitylos 172  
 Oligaitidai of Corinth 100  
 olive crown 114, 115, cf. 158  
 olive-oil: first-fruits of 145; given to athletes 134; as prize 101, 117–18, 143  
 olives 31, cf. 158  
 Olympia x, xiii, 11, 12, 24, 28, 100, 101, 102, 106–10, 112, 116, 117, 118, 120–2, 139, 141, 147, 149, 153, 161, 173; accommodation 13, 207, 209, 210; age categories 200; altars 45, 105, 107, 108, 109, 194; Altis 107, 114, 174, 175; bathing 108; battle in 364 41, 47–9; bribery 223; chariot-racing sponsored by women 195; competitions as religious contests 109–10, 121, 225, cf. 122–3; competitions dropped 108; conditions at 107–8; crowds at 108; dates 30, 99, 108; deaths 220; dedications at 169, 174–5, 217–19; diplomatic activity at 22; distance from Athens 36; Echo Colonnade 109–10; excitement of contests 108; fines 106, 108, 222–4; flies 105; foundation myth 2, 104, 107, cf. xiii; girls 194–5; heat at 108; hieromenia 3; Hippodameion 186; Kronos, hill of 104; metal-working 217–18; noisy 108; oaths 45, 105, 223; oracle of Zeus 49–50, 89, 94, 97; Pelops 104, 107, 186; Persians 44; prizes 114; road from Elis 35; Romans 165–6; rules for competitions 109, 220, 224–5; sacred truce 2–3, 45–7, fines for breaking 45–6; scarcity of water 213; Spartans excluded from 4, 44–7; spondophoroi 2, 6, 47; stadium 108, 109–10, 223; statues 174–5; theoriai and theoroi 17, 19, 25; training period 30, 108, 221–2; victory crown (wild olive) 114, 115; votive offerings 218; weight lifting 175; women forbidden 105, 193–6; *see* athletes, hellanodikai  
 Olympiad 99  
 Olympias 185  
 omens 24, 83  
 Opheltes 104, 112  
 opium 66  
 Opous 62  
 oracular centres xii, xiii, 38–40, 80–97, 103; *see* Abai, Amphiaraion (Oropos, Thebes), Claros, Delphi, Didyma, Dodona, Lebadeia, Olympia, Siwah  
 Orchomenos, Orchomenians 102, 135  
 Orchomenos Minyeios 139  
 Orestes 83  
 orgia 193  
 Orion 30  
 Oropos *see* Amphiaraion  
 ‘ou phora’ 160–1, 216  
 Ovid 65

# INDEX

- oxen 218
- Painted Stoa 62
- painting competitions 111, 112
- palaestra 107, 122
- Pallas Tritogeneia 93
- palm, of victory 114, 126; cf. 127
- Pamboeotia 138
- Panathenaia (Little and Great), at
  - Athens x, 6, 13, 20, 21–2, 23, 33, 100, 101, 124, 125, 141–3, 173, 176; age categories 101; allies' offerings (cow and panoply) 143; contests at 101, 114, 115, 142; date 6, 142; establishment of 141; meat distribution at 143; prizes 101, 115–16; procession 142, 143; Sacred Way 37
- Panathenaia, at Ilium 133–5, 221
- Panathenaic amphorai 114, 115–18, 142, 143, 176
- Panathenaic Way 63, 142
- Pandaros 170
- panegyris (pl. panegyreis) x, xii, 103, 134, 138, 214, 215, 217; *see* festival
- panhellenic, definition of x
- Panionia (festival) 130, 148, 210–11
- Panionion (site) 128–32, 147
- pankration 101, 109, 115, 117, 120, 121, 142, 174, 220, 222, 224, 225
- Panopeos 193
- panoply (of arms) 21, 143–4, 146
- Paralos 32
- Parion 133, 134, 221
- Paros 24, 26, 116, 143–4, 146, 150, 179, 186
- parthenoi, *see* girls
- Parthenon frieze 142
- pasturing 211–12
- Patroklos 115
- Pausanias 36, 72, 73, 78, 83, 104, 105, 106, 109, 110, 114, 128, 129, 135–6, 142, 151, 152, 159, 161–2, 174–5, 176, 178, 179, 180, 193, 194, 223, 224, 225
- pax Romana 57–8, 87
- Peace of Nikias xii, xiii, 34, 38–40, 103
- peddlers x, 215
- Peisirodos 194
- Peisistratos, Peisistratids 85, 119, 125, 141, 143, 238 n. 79; *see* Hipparchos
- pelanos 81, 84, 154–5, 167, 171, 192
- Pellana 75, 102, 116, 186, 189, 192
- Peloponnese, Peloponnesians xiii, 24, 36, 39, 88, 114
- Peloponnesian League 39
- Peloponnesian War 4, 22, 25, 38–42, 43, 44, 47, 125; Delphic oracle about in 432 89; *see* Dekeleia, Peace of Nikias
- Pelops 104, 107, 186
- penny-royal 61, 65
- pentapolis 133
- pentathlon 101, 108, 117, 142, 175, 222, 223
- penteteric, definition of 5, 99
- peplos 142
- Perdikkas III of Macedon 33
- Pergamon xi, 13, 19, 23, 26, 53, 74, 75, 77, 149, 153, 158, 159, 166, 172, 177, 187, 188
- Periallos 85
- Perikles 64, 142
- periodonikai 100
- periodos xv
- Persephone 61, 64, 65, 66, 71, 163, 168, 176, 184
- Perseus 28, 53
- Persian Wars 32, 35, 44, 62, 63, 97, 179; *see* Xerxes
- Persians 62, 89, 103, 120, 125, 179
- phallus: Eleusinian godhead 68; offering of 144
- Phaselis 167
- Phayllos of Kroton 120, 173
- Pheia 31
- Pheidias 107, 108, 145, 217
- Pheidon of Argos 44, 56
- Pherai 38, 75, 185, 192
- Pherenike *see* Kallipateira
- Philinos 81
- Philip II of Macedon 32–3, 52, 185
- Philip V of Macedon 28, 52
- Philippi 23, 56–7
- Philippos of Kroton 120

# INDEX

- Philista 96
- Philomelos 154
- philosophers 180; at festivals 103, 108
- Philostratos 74, 82, 114
- Phintys 196
- Phlegyans 50
- Phoibidas 41
- Phokaia 93, 129
- Phokis, Phokians 4, 7, 20, 26, 37, 39, 40, 51, 164
- Phrynon (fourth century) 32–3, 54
- Phrynon (seventh century) 120
- Phthia 116
- Phylake 102
- Phyle 24
- phyllobolia 115
- Phyrkos 44
- piety xiii, 21, 28, 40, 89, 177
- piglet, pigs 61, 63, 66, 77, 158–60, 162, 168, 169, 170, 171, 191
- pilgrimage: compulsory 141–7, 202; definition xii–xiii, xv; ethnic xi, 124–48; excluding non-Greeks 62, 164–6; expenses 158, 160, 166–72, 185, 214 (of baths); political manipulation of 127; popularity (*see* pilgrims, numbers of) 27–8; by proxy 78, 176–7, cf. 164; subsidies 19, 127, 134–5; vocabulary of xii–iii, 228 n. 5
- pilgrims: behaviour xiv, 22, 70, 204–6, cf. 76; children as 200–1; cosmetics of 198; distances travelled 36–7, 184, 185, 201; footwear 198–9; hair styles of 198–9; inviolability of 27–9; kings as 185; numbers of x, 63–4, 191; official 1–26; Peloponnesian War 38–42, 44–7; royal women 185, 189; safety of 27–59; socio-economic status xv, 38, 171, 185, 198, 203; taxes and tolls 50–1; women 183–203; *see* accommodation, clothing, death, festivals, travel, women
- pinax (pl. pinakes) 169
- Pindar 6, 69, 101–2, 107, 115–16, 139, 152, 200, 222
- Piraeus 23, 158
- pirates 32–4, 226
- Pisa, Pisans 2, 47, 106, 107
- Pittakos of Mytilene 120
- plagues 78; oracles sought concerning 81, 88
- Plataea xi, 28, 90, 147, 150; accommodation 207–8; daughter of river god 138; *see* Daidala, Eleutheria
- Plato 37, 94, 103, 153, 210, 222
- Pleiades 30
- Pleistoanax (Spartan king) 85
- Ploutos 76, 152
- Plutarch 11, 16, 18, 28, 40, 49, 54, 56, 65, 67, 69, 71, 81, 83, 84–5, 87, 119, 126–8, 150, 154, 193
- Plutonion 152
- Podalirios 158
- Polemon 241 n. 26
- pollution 61, 72, 187, 220
- Polybius 6
- Polykrates 257 n. 2
- Polymnestor of Miletos 121
- pomegranates 61, 114
- Pompeion 63, 142
- Pontos 29
- Porphry 200
- Poseidon x, xi, 30, 32, 36, 43, 104, 111, 131, 138; Poseidon Helikonios 129
- Poseidonia 139, 160
- potikephalaia 197
- Praenestine cista 248 n. 154
- Praetextatus, proconsul of Greece 70
- Prasiai 128
- Prasieis 139
- prayer xi, 31, 89, 94, 96, 97, 106, 123, 159, 161
- pregnancy 76–7, 78, 169, 184, 188–92
- presbeutes (pl. presbeutai) 5, 12
- prices 160, 166–8, 214, 215; price increases 166–7
- Priene 19, 20, 21–2, 129, 130, 146
- priests, priestesses 22, 31, 35, 62,

# INDEX

- 63, 68, 70, 72, 91, 105, 114, 121, 150–1, 152, 153, 159, 160, 162, 164, 166, 167, 168, 169, 177, 185, 191, 194, 196–7, 200, 205; high priests 21, 22; *see* Pythia (priestess)
- Priscus 208
- prize contests (chrematitai agones), prizes 30, 101, 103, 109, 114, 115, 116, 117, 121, 125, 139, 143, 174, 176, 224; *see* crowns, stephanitai agones, wreaths
- probouloi 28
- processions 40, 122, 134, 153, 202; *see* Eleusinian Mysteries, Panathenaia, Sacred Road, Sacred Way
- proedria 117, 234 n. 128
- Proklos 67
- promanteia 24, 83, 92, 155–6, 234 n. 128
- Pronapes 173
- Prophetes 10
- prophetes 84, 91, 164
- prostitutes 180, 189
- Protesilaos 255 n. 86
- Proteus the Cynic 213
- proxenos 14, 86, 154–5
- prytaneion 19, 116, 118
- prytany 9, 230 n. 34
- Ptoion (at Ptoios, Boeotia) 97, 140–1
- Ptolemaia 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 102, 221
- Ptolemies 25; *see* Ptolemy I, II, VI
- Ptolemy I (Soter) 233 n. 107
- Ptolemy II Philadelphos 15, 16, 19
- Ptolemy VI 23
- puberty 201
- purity xiv, 60, 61, 62, 64, 66, 72, 84, 149, 159, 161, 186–9, 199, 220
- Pyanopsion 2, 193
- Pyloi 37, 189
- Pythagoras, Pythagoreans xii, 139–40, 196, 197, 215; cf. 180
- Pythais 24, 37
- Pythaistai 24
- Pythia (festival) x, 11, 12, 23, 20, 38, 81, 100, 101, 102, 107, 110–11, 116, 117, 120, 149, 173; age categories at 200; agonothetai 200; chariot-racing 102, 110, 111; crowns 201; dates 3, 30, 99, 110; establishment of 110, 141; female contestants 196; foundation myth 100; held at Athens, 290 bc 49; hieromenia 3; musical contests 110–11; painting competition 111; prizes 110; procession 40; sacred truce 2–4, 40, 41, 53; theoroi 6, 17, 18; victory crown 114; wine at 206
- Pythia (priestess) xi, 82–90, 145, 154–5, 177; bathes 83; bribed 85–6, 238 n. 79; chewed laurel? 84; deprived of office 85; manic? 82–3, 84–6; married 83; numbers of 83; oracles in verse and prose 84–5, 87; oracular responses coherent 84; orders Athens to pay Olympic fine 45; Periallos 85; social background 85; visible to consultant 84
- Pythioi 24
- queens 14; *see* Andromache of Epeiros, Olympias
- race in armour 101, 142
- rakoi 202
- rams 140, 159, 161
- red mullet 163
- rhapsodes 143, 153
- Rheitoi streams 35, 62, 64
- Rheneia 127, 220, 257 n. 2
- Rhittenia 140
- Rhodes 26, 114, 130, 132, 139, 162; Asklepieion 172; *see* Diagoras of Rhodes
- ribbons 64, 161, 162; *see* victory fillet
- rings 71, 199
- riots 49
- ritual meals 160–1, 216
- roads 23, 34–8, 139, 172
- rocks, dedicated 171, cf. 175
- Rome, Romans 44, 53, 57–8, 61, 71, 87, 139, 155, 165, 166, 179

# INDEX

- roses, rose-campion 114
- running 100–1, 104, 109, 117, 142, 224, 226; *see* Heraia, race in  
armour, stade
- sacred animals 212
- sacred land 51, 135, 212
- Sacred Road 64, 201
- sacred ships 32
- sacred truces xiv, 1–8, 27, 54;  
Argive 6, 49–50, 89, 97; breaking  
of 10, 32–3; Eleusinian 2, 3–4;  
Isthmian 2, 3; length of 2–3;  
manipulation of 49–50; Nemean  
2, 3; Olympian 2, 3, 10;  
proclamation of 10–11, 33;  
Pythian 2, 3; *see ekecheiria*,  
*epangelia*
- Sacred Wars 27, 50–4; First 50–1,  
110; Fourth 51–2; Second 51;  
Third 51, 193
- Sacred Way; Didyma 36, 91;  
Eleusis xii, 34, 36, 64, cf. xv, 62;  
Panathenaia (Athens) 37; *see*  
Sacred Road
- sacrifices xi, xiii, 9, 15, 16, 17, 19,  
20–2, 24, 32, 39, 43, 45, 48, 52,  
53, 56, 66, 69, 90, 91, 97, 103,  
104, 105, 110, 113, 122, 127, 129,  
131, 132, 134, 136–8, 139, 140,  
143, 146, 150, 153, 154, 155,  
157–61, 166, 170, 185, 192, 194,  
206, 216, 217; at Delphi 81, 83,  
84, 168; by hewing limbs off 73;  
of bull with gilded horns 21; of  
112 beasts 20; ‘to which god to  
sacrifice?’ 89, 94–5, 97; willing  
sacrifice necessary xii, 83, 84; *see*  
human sacrifice
- sacrilege 41, 131, 179, 219; *see*  
*asebeia*, impiety
- sail 142
- sailing season 29–31, 144–5, cf. 108
- sailors 39
- St Damian 247 n. 129
- St Kosmas 247 n. 129
- Salamis 67, 145, 173, 224
- Samos 129, 130, 211
- Samothrace 24, 149, 152, 153;  
anaktoron 71, 72; apotropaic?  
71; ‘dangers on the sea’ 71;  
dining rooms 160; epopteia 72;  
epoptes (pl. epoptai) 72; female  
mystai 184; Greek speakers only  
71; Hall of the Votive Gifts 172;  
hieron 72; iron rings 71;  
ithyphallic statues 71; lists of  
mystai 29, 70, 153; proclamation  
72; provenance of mystai 71, and  
theoroi 26; secrecy 177, 179,  
180; Spartans 71; tainia 71
- sanctuaries: access to 4, 44–7,  
149–53, 178–9; *see*  
Amphiaraiion, festivals,  
Eleusinian Mysteries,  
Epidauros, Isthmia, Nemea,  
Olympia, Pergamon, Pythia,  
temples
- Sarapion 85
- Sardinians 155
- Sardis 56, 120, 130
- Satrai (Thracian tribe) 83
- sceptre (kerykeion) of heralds 8,  
231 n. 52
- Scythia 128
- seat of honour 117; *see* proedria
- seating at contests 108
- Sebasta (Naples) 34, 103, 220,  
226–7
- Sebasteia (Athens): female  
contestants 196
- seer 22
- Seleucid dynasty 25; *see* Antiochos
- Semakos 224
- Semele 186
- semen 188
- senatus consultum 57
- Septerion 200
- serpent-column 249 n.188
- serpents 78–9, 171, 190–1, 199
- Sextus Africanus xiii, 107
- sexual intercourse xiv, 68, 186, 187;  
abstinence from 65, 188, 222;  
extra-marital 187; in temples 188
- sexual segregation 188
- shields, as prizes 116, 117
- ships xiv, 21, 22, 29–31, 33, 127,  
142; sacred 32

# INDEX

- shipwreck 34, 72, 172, 220
- Sibyl 82
- Sicilian Expedition 31, 119
- Sicily x, 15, 25, 27, 29, 31, 39, 75, 88, 100, 102, 107
- sickness, *see* Amphiaraion, Asklepieia, Epidauros, Pergamon
- Sigeion 120
- sikya 77, 190
- Sikyon 26, 78, 88, 111, 190, 199; female contestants 196; festival at 102, 116, 196; hosts Isthmia 44; prizes 116 *see* Kleisthenes of Sikyon
- silver: 172, 210, 216; cups 31; prizes 116, 139
- Simonides 120
- sindonites 197–8
- singing 101, 104, 125, 126, 127; *see* chorus
- Sinope 128
- Siphnian treasury 84
- sitesis *see* athletes: dining privileges
- Siwah 25, 39, 80, 94, 96
- 'Sixteen Women' 194
- skene (pl. skenai) *see* tents
- Skepsis 133
- Skiathos 86, 167–8
- Skillous 140, 210
- slaves xi, xiv, 58, 80, 215, 216, 217; athletes enslaved 3, 54; initiates at Andania and Eleusis 61, 168, 196; kidnapped 95; no access to rites 150, 151
- Smyrna 129, 200
- Socrates 89, 116, 153, 171, 257 n. 8
- Solon 108, 116–17
- sons 14, 100, 121
- sophists, at festivals 103
- Sophocles 69, 178
- Sostrata of Pherai 77, 80, 185
- Sotades of Crete 226
- Soteria 13, 17, 19, 21, 221
- Sotion 221
- Sounion 17, 22, 25, 32, 37
- Spain xiv
- Sparta, Spartans (including Lakonia) xii, 9, 22–3, 28, 37, 40, 49–50, 51, 55, 73, 75, 120, 139, 150, 177, 192, 195; boxing 109; celebrate Isthmia 43–4; chariot racing 46–7, 109, 114, 174, 195; competitors 109, 113, 119, 120; consultations of oracles 49–50, 85–6, 88, 89, 94, 97; dedications of 174–5; Eleusinian procession 4, 41–2; excluded from Olympia 44–7; pankration 109; wrestling 109, 119; *see* Agesilaos, Agesipolis, Agis, Akrotatos, Archidamos, Demaratos, Dorieus, Kleomenes I, II, Kyniska, Lichas, Lysander, Olympia: exclusion from, Pleistoanax, Pythioi
- spectators x, xii, xiii, xv, 37, 39, 55, 103–5, 106, 108, 110, 194, 215
- spondai (mysteriotides, Olympiakai) 2, 3; *see* sacred truces
- spondophoroi xiii, 1–3, 26, 27, 47; dokimasia (audit) 9; Eleusinian 3–10, 20; financial payments to 8–9; inviolability 9; numbers of 7, 20; Eleian, for Olympia 5–7, 9, 20
- spring (season) 29, 61
- stade (stadion) 101, 106, 107, 118, 142, 165, 196, 200; *see* running
- stadium x, 46, 55, 107, 108, 109–10, 113, 195, 213, 223, 224
- statues 8, 24, 78, 81, 89, 106, 107, 114, 115, 127, 145, 152, 161, 172, 173, 195, 223, 224, 226
- stephanitai agones (crown contests) x, 99, 101, 114, 118, 119; *see* Isthmia, Nemea, Olympia, Pythia; prizes
- Stesimbrotos 244 n. 72
- stlengis 197, 231 n. 51
- stoa 109
- storm, storms 29–30, 72, 94
- Strabo 34, 36, 74, 81, 96, 129, 132, 138, 140
- strangers 149, 150, 161; outsiders 149, 181

# INDEX

- strategia (office of general),  
  strategos (general; pl. strategoi)  
    17, 23, 41, 42, 56, 190
- Suda 202
- summer 29, 108
- Sybaris 117, 120, 139, 173, 174
- synedrion 133–5
- synoikismos 43, 130, 150
- Syracuse 15, 26, 102, 103, 139, 226;  
  *see* Dionysios, Hieron
- Syria 7
- Tamynai 139
- Tanagra, Tanagraians 24, 135
- technitai 111, 234 n. 132
- Tegea 102, 116, 170
- Telemachos of Pharsalos 220
- Telestas 113
- teleute 61
- temenos 67, 152, 172
- Tempe 114, 201
- temples xvi, 116, 134, 150, 172, 176,  
  178; accommodation in 43, 151,  
  206–7, 210, 211; asylia of 58;  
  burning down 55, 213; death in  
  116, 174, 175, 176; Delphic 81–5,  
  167; Didyma 91; Epidauros 74;  
  Nemean (destroyed) 55;  
  Olympia 107; and pregnant  
  women 188; sexual intercourse in  
  188
- Tenedos 6, 24
- Tenos 24, 128, 139, 160
- tents 13, 49, 130, 140, 160, 209–11,  
  216
- Teos 34, 129, 130, 132
- Tertullian 68
- tetrapolis (Attika) 25
- Thalamai 172
- Thales 108
- thanksgiving offerings *see*  
  dedications
- Thasos 75
- Theagenes, tyrant of Megara 118
- Theaios of Argos 115–16
- Thebes, Thebans 10, 15, 37, 39, 40,  
  41, 42, 47, 62, 73, 75, 97, 102,  
  116, 135–6, 139, 147, 164, 179
- theft, thieves 69, 95, 161, 205, 215
- Thelpoussa 13
- Themis 158
- Themistokles 49, 90, 103, 224
- Theodoros 179
- Theogenes of Thasos 101, 108,  
  121–2, 225
- Theoi Megaloi (Great Gods) 71, 73
- theokoloi ('servants of the god') 6
- Theophrastos 68
- theoria (pl. theoriai) 6, 11, 153, 205,  
  210, 221; Athenian, to Delos 16,  
  18–19, 22, 25, 126–8; of Athenian  
  tetrapolis 25; of kings 139; of  
  Sicilian tyrants 49, 100; Sounion  
  17, 22, 25, 32
- theorodokia 1, 13, 207; hereditary  
  13
- theorodokos (pl. theorodokoi) 1, 8,  
  11–20, 26, 113, 207; choice of  
  12–13; definition 12; hereditary  
  13–14; honoured 24; lists of 12,  
  17–18; monarchs as 199; non-  
  citizens as 24; socio-economic  
  background 15; women as 199
- theoros (pl. theoroi) xiv, 1, 3, 5, 6,  
  11–20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33,  
  90, 137, 200; choice of 13–14, 17;  
  definition xiii, 11–12; as  
  diplomats 22–4; drowned 56;  
  duties: to carry first-fruits: 21,  
  to sacrifice: 19–22; executed 56;  
  expenses 18–19; given escort  
  23–4, 56–7; honoured 23–4;  
  killed by Herakles 57; payments  
  to 19, 134–5; sailing from Sicily  
  31; seized 17, 32, 57, 131; socio-  
  economic background 16, 17, 19;  
  tents 130, 210; travel by ship 17,  
  22, 25, 31, 32, 127; travel in  
  groups of two or three 20; *see*  
  architheoroi
- Thera 268 n. 147
- Thermos 138
- Thersandros of Halieis 38, 77, 199
- thesauros *see* offertory box
- Theseion 274 n.37
- Theseus 111, 126
- Thesmophoria 41, 184, 186, 193
- Thespieians 135

# INDEX

- Thessaly 7, 26, 52, 74, 75, 86, 102, 185, 201  
 Thirty Tyrants 42  
 Thoudippos 143–4  
 Thourioi 88  
 Thrace 24, 26, 29, 71, 83  
 Thrasyboulos 95  
 Thucydides xii, xiii, 3, 31, 89, 103, 125–6, 131, 146  
 Thyiades 37, 184, 193  
 Tiberius 58, 165  
 Timodemidai of Athens 100  
 Tithorea, Tithoreans 152, 211  
 torch-bearer *see* Eleusinian Mysteries  
 torch-race 142  
 Torone 75  
 Torre Nova sarcophagus 66  
 trainers 102, 107, 113, 115, 194, 223, 224  
 Tralles 26, 152  
 travel xv, 3, 38; by land, road xii, 24, 34–8, 112; provisions 64; by ship xii, 176, 185; walking 36–7, 140, 201; *see* sailing season, ships, wagons  
 trees 139, 211–13; *see* oak tree  
 triakonter 22, 126  
 Trichoneians 4, 8, 10  
 trierarch, trierarchia 18–19, 127  
 triglyphs 107  
 Triikka 74, 75  
 Triopion 116, 132–3, 147, 175  
 tripods; as prizes 114, 115, 116, 133, 175, 176; as dedications 133, 175, 176, 218; Delphic 82, 84, 154  
 Triptolemos 61, 68, 243 n. 60  
 Troad xi, 133  
 Troilos 109  
 Troizen 75, 116, 190, 192; amphiktyony 138–9; Asklepieion 74, 75  
 Trophonios *see* Lebadeia  
 Troy xiii, 69, 126, 176  
 Trygaios 168  
 Tryphosa 196  
 Tyche 158, 161  
 tyrants 14; *see* Demetrios of Phaleron, Dionysios, Hieron, Hipparchos, Hippias, Kleithenes (of Sikyon), Peisistratos, Pheidon, Polykrates  
 Tyre 21  
 umpire *see* diaitater, judge, hellanodikai  
 Valentinian 70  
 Varro 71  
 vegetarianism 139  
 victors 24, 115, 116, 173–6; *see* prizes  
 victory fillets 114–15  
 victory odes 101–2, 107  
 victory palm 126  
 victory, proclamation of 115  
 Virgil 82  
 virgins 138; Pythia dressed as 83; sacred 73; *see* girls  
 votive offerings *see* dedications  
 Vulci kylix 248 n. 154  
 ‘wagon-rollers’ 56, cf. 38  
 wagons xv, 8, 33, 35, 38, 62, 63, 64, 73, 78, 136–8  
 war 2, 10, 23, 28, 32, 38, 40, 50, 81, 88, 89, 106, 131, 154, 164; *see* armistice, Peloponnesian War, Sacred Wars  
 water: drinking 213–14; ritual significance 214; therapeutic 158–9  
 weight lifting 175  
 weights and measures 215  
 wet dream 78, 188  
 winds *see* sailing season  
 wine 30, 31, 137; abstinence 61, 65, 163–4, 206; athletes 206; -cups (prizes) 116; drunken Megarians 56; Knidos 206  
 winter 29–30, 79, 153  
 ‘without dust’ *see* akoniti  
 wives 189, 200  
 women 151, 161, 163, 168, 181; avoidance of sex with 222; cheaper initiation fees 168; consultants at Delphi 192; consultants at Epidauros xi,



# INDEX

- 77–80, 189–92; cosmetics 198;
- cults excluded from 179, 186–7;
- cults exclusive to 183, 186–7;
- finance chariot-racing at
- Olympia 195; hair-styles 198–9;
- independent travellers 184;
- miscarriages 192; Olympic
- festival (barred from) 105, 193–6;
- ornaments 198–9; pilgrims 126,
- 140, 183–203; pregnancies 76–7,
- 78, 169, 184, 188–92; promote
- fertility 183; proselytisers of
- cults 199–200; seclusion 183–4;
- sexual purity 186, 187–9;
- theorodokoi 199; *see* childbirth,
- clothing, prostitutes,
- Thesmophoria
- worshippers, behaviour of 204–6
- wreaths x, 8, 48, 106, 110, 114–15,
- 127, 158, 160; dedication of 161,
- 172, 226; price of 160, 166
- wrestling 48, 101, 109, 114, 115,
- 116, 117, 142, 220, 225
- 
- xenia 16, 19, 20
- xenodokoi 15
- xenoi *see* strangers
- Xenokles 35
- xenon 207–8
- Xenophanes of Kolophon 117–18
- 
- Xenophon (Athenian) 6, 42, 43, 47,
- 48, 49, 50, 89, 140, 210
- Xenophon of Corinth 102
- Xenophontic *Athenaion Politeia*
- 146
- Xerxes xii
- xoanon 135
- Xouthos 14, 86, 94
- 
- youth, youths xiv; age category
- 101, 112, 113, 200, 226; choruses
- of 126; cure at Epidauros 78;
- financial allowance at Sebasta
- 226; lover of? 115; prizes 117;
- victor 115
- 
- Zan 140
- Zanes 106, 223–4
- Zankle 88
- Zeus x, xiii, 6, 17, 24, 30, 36, 39,
- 45, 48, 50, 55, 61, 69, 78, 87, 104,
- 107, 108, 109, 112, 118, 136–8,
- 174, 175, 194, 223, 225; Zeus
- Apomyios 252 n. 25; Zeus
- Astrapaos 24; Zeus Horkios 105;
- Zeus Idaios 139–40; Zeus
- Lykaos 139, 152; Zeus Naos
- 95–6; oracle of (Olympia) 49–50,
- 89, 94, 97; *see* Dodona, Nemea,
- Olympia







